DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 827 CG 016 295

TITLE	Oversight on 1981 White House Conference on Aging: Los Angeles. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests of the Select Committee on Aging. House of Representatives, Ninety-Seventh Congress, Second Session. Committee Publication No. 97-325.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Select Committee on Aging.
PUB DATE	7 Jan 82
NOTE	128p.; Some pages are of marginal legibility. For related documents, see CG 015 980-987; CG 015 990 - 016 022.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Activism; *Aging (Individuals); Alienation; *Citizen Participation; *Federal Programs; Gerontology; *Government Role; Hearings; *Older Adults; Political Affiliation; Program Development; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*White House Conference on Aging

ABSTRACT

This report deals with testimony from delegates to the 1981 White House Conference on Aging and contains the delegates' and observers' evaluations of the conference and their recommendations. The statements provided include those of the conference director and other staff members and representatives from the audience who describe the planning of the conference. The paper discusses administration alterations of the conference objectives and the difficulties encountered with the change in political administrations. Recommendations about the organization of the conference and the available facilities are also detailed. The appendices contain materials from various members of national organizations representing the elderly and several delegates. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222827

OVERSIGHT ON 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING: LOS ANGELES

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
HOUSING AND CONSUMER INTERESTS

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 7, 1982, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on Aging

Comm. Pub. No. 97-325

CG 016295

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
92-241 O WASHINGTON : 1982

SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida, *Chairman*

EDWARD R. ROYBAL, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
JOHN L. BURTON, California
DON BONKER, Washington
THOMAS J. DOWNEY, New York
JAMES J. FLORIO, New Jersey
HAROLD E. FORD, Tennessee
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey
MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD, Tennessee
JIM SANTINI, Nevada
DAVID W. EVANS, Indiana
STANLEY N. LUNDINE, New York
MARY ROSE OAKAR, Ohio
THOMAS A. LUKEN, Ohio
GERALDINE A. FERRARO, New York
BEVERLY B. BYRON, Maryland
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
DAN MICA, Florida
HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
MIKE SYNAR, Oklahoma
EUGENE V. ATKINSON, Pennsylvania
BUTLER DERRICK, South Carolina
BRUCE F. VENTO, Minnesota
BARNEY FRANK, Massachusetts
TOM LANTOS, California
BOB SHAMANSKY, Ohio
RON WYDEN, Oregon
DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA, Michigan
GEO. W. CROCKETT, Jr., Michigan
WILLIAM HILL BONER, Tennessee

MATTHEW J. RINALDO, New Jersey,
Ranking Minority Member
WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
MARC L. MARKS, Pennsylvania
RALPH REGULA, Ohio
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California
HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK, New Jersey
NORMAN D. SHUMWAY, California
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
DAN LUNGREN, California
MILLICENT FENWICK, New Jersey
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
DAN COATS, Indiana
GEORGE C. WORTLEY, New York
HAL DAUB, Nebraska
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas
BILL HENDON, North Carolina
GREGORY W. CARMAN, New York
COOPER EVANS, Iowa

CHARLES H. EDWARDS III, *Chief of Staff*
YOSEF J. RIEMER, *Deputy Chief of Staff*
VAL J. HALAMANDARIS, *Senior Counsel*
JAMES A. BRENNAN, *Assistant to the Chairman*
WALTER A. GUNTHARP, Ph. D., *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND CONSUMER INTERESTS

EDWARD R. ROYBAL, California, *Chairman*

JIM SANTINI, Nevada
BEVERLY B. BYRON, Maryland
TOM LANTOS, California
BOB SHAMANSKY, Ohio
GEO. W. CROCKETT, Jr., Michigan
STANLEY N. LUNDINE, New York
MIKE SYNAR, Oklahoma

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas,
Ranking Minority Member
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California
GEORGE C. WORTLEY, New York
BILL HENDON, North Carolina
GREGORY W. CARMAN, New York
COOPER EVANS, Iowa

JORGE J. LAMBRINOS, *Majority Staff Director*
PATRICIA C. LAWRENCE, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Page
Opening statement of Chairman Edward R. Roybal 1

Chronological List of Witnesses

Jerry Waldie, Executive Director, 1981 White House Conference on Aging 2
Leon Harper, Ex-Deputy Executive Director, 1981 White House Conference on Aging 7
Janet Levy, California State Director on Aging, State Coordinator for 1981 White House Conference on Aging 14
Milton Tepper, Vice Chairman, City of Los Angeles Council on Aging 18
Betty Kozasa, Chairman, Asian Pacific Resource Center on Aging; and Chairman, Los Angeles City Council on Aging 21
Fernando Torres-Gil, Professor of Gerontology, University of Southern California 23
Janet Levy, California State Director on Aging; State Coordinator for 1981 White House Conference on Aging 30
Carmela Lacayo, Executive Director, Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores 32
Andy Gutierrez, Los Angeles City and County Coordinator for 1981 White House Conference on Aging 36
Dr. Robert Ruby, San Diego Delegate, 1981 White House Conference on Aging 38
Dr. Ruth Weg, Observer, 1981 White House Conference on Aging 45
Eva Kirby, 1981 White House Conference on Aging Delegate Appointed by Representative Bobbi Fiedler; Member, Economic Well-being Committee 48
Margaret Helton, San Diego Delegate, 1981 White House Conference on Aging; Chairperson, Technical Advisory Council, Family and Community Support Systems Committee 52
Barbara Garcia-Weed, 1981 White House Conference on Aging Delegate; Member, Older Americans as a Continuing Resource Committee 57
Helen Huber, 1981 White House Conference on Aging Delegate; Member, Public Sector Roles and Structures Committee 59
Toni Rini, 1981 White House Conference on Aging Delegate, Appointed by Representative Edward R. Roybal 60
Dr. James Birren, Executive Director, Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center, University of Southern California; and Delegate, 1981 White House Conference on Aging 64
Dr. Percil Stanford, San Diego Delegate, 1981 White House Conference on Aging; Member, Education and Training Opportunities Committee 66
Morris Better, Member, National Steering Committee, Gray Panthers; and Delegate at Large, 1981 White House Conference on Aging 68

Audience Participants

Lois Hamer, Van Nuys, Calif 75
Amalia Guerrero, Los Angeles, Calif 75
Zelda Eliot, Palm Springs, Calif 76
Frank Dwyer, Santa Maria, Calif 76
Enrique Garcia 87
Rose Kirkham 87
Robert Stotelmeyer 87
George Hamilton 88
Lupe Morales 88
Cruz Sandoval, Anaheim, Calif 88
Irene Beam, Eagle Rock, Calif 88

Appendix

Additional material received for the record:
    Morris Better, Member, National Steering Committee, Gray Panthers; and Delegate at Large, 1981 White House Conference on Aging, prepared statement 91

Additional material received for the record—Continued

Page
Esther Coleman, Delegate, 1981 White House Conference on Aging, letter and conference report ... 93
Evelyn Herrmann, Chief of Senior Services, San Diego, Calif., prepared statement ... 94
Harry Doughty, Redding, Calif., Delegate, 1981 White House Conference on Aging, appointed by Representative Gene Chappie, conference report ... 95
Carl A. Larson, President, Green Thumb, Inc., Arlington, Va., prepared statement ... 96

OVERSIGHT ON 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING: LOS ANGELES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1982

U.S. House of Representatives,
Select Committee on Aging,
Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests,
Los Angeles, Calif.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:15 a.m., at the Highland Park Senior Center, 6125 North Figueroa, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Edward R. Roybal (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Member present: Representative Roybal of California.

Staff present: Jorge Lambrinos, staff director, and Shiela Duffy, volunteer intern.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN EDWARD R. ROYBAL

Mr. Roybal. Ladies and gentlemen, the Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests will now come to order.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to welcome all of you to the very active and very effective senior citizen's center, which serves many older residents of Highland Park. I want to especially thank, Ms. Peggy Yoshimoto, director of the center, and Mr. Pete Cotti and Mr. Ray Serverns, the custodians, for this help in preparing for this hearing. I also want to thank the Thursday Senior Citizen's Club for their help in providing the coffee and doughnuts.

Most importantly, I want to thank all the seniors who make use of this facility for their cooperation and the generosity which they demonstrated in canceling their meeting and making it possible for us to hold the hearing today.

Special thanks also must go to Mrs. Janet Levy, the State coordinator for the 1981 White House Conference, and Mr. Morris Better and Mr. Fernando Torres-Gil for their assistance in making the hearing possible.

The purpose of this hearing is to hear testimony from delegates and observers who attended the recent White House Conference on Aging. As a member of the House Committee on Aging, and chairman of the subcommittee, I am very much interested in assuring that the product of this conference is worthwhile and does become worthwhile and does in fact reflect the concerns and needs of older persons throughout this Nation.

Here today are many of the California delegates and observers who attended the 1981 White House Conference on Aging. This hearing will provide them an opportunity to report back to Congress, the same Congress which authorized and appropriated the funds for this national meeting. We want their personal evaluation of the Conference. We want to hear both the good and the bad.

We are also interested in hearing the many recommendations that the delegates made at the Conference and perhaps recommendations as to how they can be implemented because just recommendations with no effort to implement those recommendations is, in my opinion, a waste of time.

So, I hope that you can also tell the committee what it is that the Congress of the United States can do to make possible the objectives of the recommendations you have made.

Now, the first witnesses this morning, in a panel of two, are Mr. Jerry Waldie, the Executive Director of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging during the Carter administration. Jerry Waldie also was a Member of the House of Representatives, my colleague. He did an excellent job as a Congressman. May I say no matter what he does, he always excels in anything that he takes part in.

Leon Harper is the other member of the panel. He is the former Deputy Director of the same Conference.

I would like to ask them to proceed in any manner which they may desire. First Mr. Waldie, and then Mr. Harper.

STATEMENT OF JERRY WALDIE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mr. **Waldie**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thought the best way at least that I could proceed is to attempt to describe the objectives that we sought in our initial planning of the White House Conference of 1981, and then to touch briefly upon how the format that we thought might attain those objectives was altered by the Reagan administration and the consequences of that alteration, as best I can determine those consequences.

Perhaps Leon Harper, the Deputy Director when I was Director, who remained with the Conference beyond the time of my service, could fill in his personal knowledge of what changes were made.

If I may, in February or March of this year—I was notified, by the way, by the administration on a Friday preceding the Monday inauguration of the President to vacate my office by 5 of that Monday afternoon, which was not any great surprise. I am not complaining about that. I was a Carter Presidential appointee. The incoming administration had every right to remove Presidential appointees.

But while the matter was fresh in my mind, I was asked to write an article for the Sacramento Bee as to what we hoped to attain in that Conference and what I thought might occur in the future.

Without intending to presume upon you, I would like to read what in February or March of this year I had listed as the objectives we sought as a planning process for the Conference.

Essentially what we were trying to do—and in furtherance of this planning, I must say that we had the wholehearted support of the then President, President Carter, and, as importantly, his Cabinet member, Patricia Harris, Health, Education and Welfare, who statutorily has the responsibility of planning White House conferences, and by a letter of delegation delegated that statutorily to me as Executive Director, but who personally and through her staff was intimately involved in all of the decisions in the initial planning.

The objectives we sought were, first, we wanted to devise a process that would involve literally hundreds of older Americans in a direct, substantial and directive way in the Conference.

Second, we wanted an opportunity provided these people for a forcible expression and a thoughtful analysis of the issues of aging, by knowledgeable professional and lay experts, as well as by the delegates.

Third, we wanted a format that would permit a selective and intense scrutiny of certain unique issues of aging that were national in nature, but sufficiently narrow in interest and visibility that a formal conference structure would minimize their importance.

We had in that regard particular reference to the impact of aging issues on minority populations in America—racial minorities, women, geographical minorities. Then they wanted a process that would have in place at the conclusion of the Conference a coalition of interested and committed national organizations that could then devote their energies and resources to advocating and monitoring implementation of the Conference recommendations.

Then I concluded this article with a thought as to what might happen. I said:

> Though my role as Executive Director was terminated by the incoming Reagan Administration on inaugural day, I am confident the objectives we sought are still obtainable if the process in place is not materially altered. I am not optimistic as to the reaction of a conservative Administration to the concerns of older Americans. Such doubts, however, only emphasize the importance of this National Conference on Aging and its potential to mobilize the older American constituency to advocate increasing response to its real needs.

To attain those objectives we designed a process that involved a lot of people early on, Mr. Chairman, in meeting and discussing the issues of aging at the community level. Then our hope was—and the process provided it—that the selection of delegates would be made in a nonpartisan political way.

The delegates would all be selected by May of this year. There would be 2,000 delegates—1,000 of them selected by the Governors of the various States, 535 by the Members of Congress, the technical committees that were appointed would be made delegates on the advisory committee, and the remaining portion of that 2,000 delegates, which would be about 250, would be appointed by the end of May by the Secretary.

The purpose of reserving that many delegates out of 2,000 was to make certain that the grid lines of ethnic representation, minority representation, gender representation and age representation that were compelled upon the Governors in the first 1,000 delegates that might be altered with the appointment of the 535 congressional delegates, that the Secretary would have an opportunity with that 200 and some delegates to restore balance to those particular grid lines.

We hoped by having all the delegates appointed in May, even though the conference was not to occur until December, to have those delegates ready to participate in what was then scheduled in our process as regional conferences, four of them throughout the country, as conference delegates, the first round of consideration of the issues as delegates to the conference would have occurred throughout the country in September.

The delegates would have had in their hands at that time all the output of the technical committees and all the output of the miniconferences scheduled on various issues throughout the country, so they would have an opportunity to immerse themselves in these issues and be as prepared as any delegate probably would have been prepared in any conference that had been ever held in a national sense.

We also wanted the people that were appointed as delegates to be known to others so that they could be solicited in terms of their views on issues. We saw them as people that were making important political recommendations to the policymakers of this country, and therefore they ought to be accessible to the special interests of this country that were interested in this issue.

Now, had that process worked, by the time those delegates arrived in Washington, D.C., they would have been functioning as committee members from September through December of the committees on which they were to serve, they would have had an opportunity to be exposed to the issues through the output of the technical committee reports, the miniconference reports, and through the capacity of individuals and organizations to contact them personally with respect to their particular points of view.

We felt that that would prevent the Conference in any way from having been co-opted by a political force. We also recognized that because of the congressional dictate, that this Conference would be commenced by one administration and terminated perhaps by another, depending upon the political decision of the American public.

In fact, that is what happened. It was planned by the Carter administration and implemented in its final form by the Reagan administration.

So, we have tried to put into place certain parts of this Conference that no matter what the political inclination of the incoming administration was, they could not materially alter the Conference.

Frankly, I was overoptimistic in my belief that that could be done. I thought because all the miniconferences were concluded and the technical committee deliberations were concluded before the change of administration, that that product would be beyond political alteration, that that would be independent, would reflect the views of the miniconference participants, would reflect the views of the technical committee members, and would be published as such and beyond the ability of an administration to alter, even though the views might be unsympathetic to that administration.

Where I erred in my optimism, believing that we would have stymied any effort to politically alter the conclusion of this Conference, was the capacity of the administration to attack this Conference and to seek to co-opt it and prevent any independent expression of will.

One way they did it, a very effective way, was they simply failed to provide access to the miniconference reports and the technical committee reports. We had budgeted for that program, was to mail those reports to every delegate by May, and to circulate them widely to the public at large so that the informational base upon which the Conference was to be predicated would be widely accessible and available.

They just simply refused to print them. To my knowledge, they have not circulated to the delegates any of those reports. There were some available in various press rooms around the Conference during the 4 days of the Conference—libraries, they called them—where delegates, if interested could go in and ask for a copy.

They were put out the day before the Conference, or the day of the Conference. So there was a concerted, obvious attempt to keep the delegates from being informed as to positions and policies that were contrary to the administration. That was one effort.

Second, they immediately canceled the September regional hearings because the September regional hearings would have come too quickly for them to put their political apparatus in place, to exert the control over the delegates that they ultimately succeeded in large part in exerting at the National Conference.

So therefore, by failing to provide literature and materials on the issues to the delegates until a week or so before the December meeting, by failing to permit the delegates to assemble and begin functioning as delegates considering the issues in September, and by failing to even provide a list of the delegates to the interested parties, they succeeded in denying to the delegates the information the delegates required to make the kind of impressive recommendations on policy issues that otherwise could be done.

That was a clear, clear political decision on the administration's part in order to effectively mute the voice that would come out of this Conference.

Then what they did, to go further, they fired all the advisory committee—50 members of the advisory committee. Extraordinary people with national reputations.

To my knowledge, as executive director I had a great deal to do with the selection process of the advisory committee. The partisan complexion of the advisory committee was never in question. Its capacity in terms of its professionalism in dealing with aging issues was always the key consideration.

Plus, the necessity of having on that advisory committee the grid lines for the entire Conference—so many females, so many blacks, so many Hispanics, so many Asians, so many native Americans, so many of a certain group—scrupulously adhered to so that the decisions of the advisory committee would reflect hopefully the decisions, processwise, of the ultimate Conference as it was constituted.

The first thing the incoming administration did, having little sympathy with those kinds of concerns, was to reconstitute the advisory committee in a rather deliberate and harsh manner by sending each member a letter advising them they were no longer a member, but urging them, if they were so inclined, to seek reappointment.

Many of them did seek reappointment. Few of them were so blessed. The newly constituted advisory committee had no intention whatsoever paid to these grid lines reflecting the diversity of the aging population and of the American population. That was a key as to what was going to happen to the rest of the Conference.

The other key was the Republican conservative view of this administration on aging issues was the hallmark of appointment to that advisory committee. Then the administration next, in order to further co-opt and prevent this Conference with coming up with recommendations that might be disturbing, stacked it. Instead of 2,000 delegates, as we had planned, they ended up with a number considerably in excess of that.

I don't know that anyone knows what that number is, because the last several weeks before the Conference they added 300 delegates, I am told. Those 300 delegates clearly were the result of a process that was instigated by ultimately, as it was revealed by hearings by your committee, a process instituted by the Republican National Committee at the behest of the White House where they did a phone survey of the attitudes of delegates that were known to the Executive Director of the White House Conference at that time, but not known to anyone else because a list was denied everyone else.

At the direct orders of Secretary Schweiker, the list was given to the chairman of the Republican committee. They employed a public relations firm to do a political poll of the delegates, to ascertain attitudes.

With that poll it is quite clear they then constituted their committees and to the extent that their committees could not be constituted in a manner to assure a Republican hard-line response, they stacked the committees with these other appointees.

The test was not loyalty to the issues of aging. The test was loyalty to the Reagan policies. That test was passed and met on the issue that was the most terrifying to the administration, and that was social security.

The administration knew that this Conference, or any conference comprised honestly of aging Americans interested in aging issues, would be supportive of the maintenance of social security.

The administration is not supportive of the maintenance of the social security system. It is supportive of a diminution of the benefits of social security and a retrenchment of the role of the Federal Government in maintaining the economic well-being of older Americans.

It stacked the committee dealing with that issue with people that would reflect the President's views rather than the aging constituency that the delegates were allegedly supposedly to represent, and the initial recommendation from that committee tread the White House line precisely and exactly.

Thanks to the intervention of the chairman of the full committee of the House of Representatives, Committee on Aging, Claude Pepper, that was somewhat muted in its impact. Other committees came out with a more clear reflection of the actual view of the elderly in this country on the social security system than the administration wanted.

I have gone on too long. I want to only conclude with this suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that the efforts of the administration I think were dictated out of fear, the fear that they expressed the most, that they seemed to be experiencing the most, was that an untrammeled expression of opinion by older Americans would be contrary to what this administration desires to do to older Americans.

So, a political attempt to destroy the independence of the conference was clumsily attempted. They succeeded to a degree only by their failure to provide the information that the delegates were entitled to.

They succeeded to a degree with their efforts to stack the membership of the delegation, but I think they probably failed in that the press fortunately became very much alert to what was happening, your committee became very much alert to what was happening, and the exposure of the clumsy political attempts of the White House I think probably enhanced the capacity of this conference to have some meaningful impact upon the policies of aging.

The literature of the conference is still available. The literature of the early days of the conference when the literature had some meaning is still available. The authority to print that literature rests with this administration through the Conference.

It would be my suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that you entertain at least an idea of seeking out that literature, the report of the mini-conferences and the reports of the technical committees, all of which were submitted and approved prior to the Reagan administration taking office, none of which have been distributed.

The distribution of those reports, it would occur to me, could be arranged through other sources than the White House Conference on Aging because they will not be distributed or printed through this present conference.

That would be I think a major contribution toward a consideration of the issues that the conference was denied the opportunity to fully consider. It would be of benefit I think to many people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you, Mr. Waldie.

Mr. Harper, will you proceed? Upon conclusion of your statement, we will have some questions.

STATEMENT OF LEON HARPER, EX-DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Waldie did an outstanding job of defining the conference process and the way it was designed to approach and to facilitate the views of older persons. I won't go into that. I would like to start at the point where Mr. Waldie left off.

Briefly, I would like to say I am Leon Harper and that I was brought on by Congressman Waldie as Executive Director because of my involvement in the aging field and my ability to do work with and use the people within the field of aging to help facilitate this process and keep it a true process.

This I did. I was involved with it. I worked with State coordinators and the aging network as a whole.

As the administration changed, one of the persons who was appointed the transition team leader for the administration was a person named Dave Rust, who was a part of the network and had a sense of what the network was all about and wanted to work with and continue the process.

As part of the official conclusion of the transition team, he concluded that this process that was laid out by Waldie was basically a good process, that the Conference was basically a bipartisan endeavor, and that it was designed in such a way to afford free expression by everybody involved. He had personally, and he recommended it continue as such, with certain minor modifications. This was accepted.

Some of the modifications made were in his estimation based on budgetary concerns such as there was a new thrust, and the regional hearings would have cost $1 million. One of the rationales for cutting out the regional hearings was to save $1 million.

One point we should be aware of. When Congressman Waldie was there, he had a delegation of authority that enabled him to move ahead and operate as the Executive Director in a manner which was consistent with his own conscience.

As Mr. Rust was brought on as the new Executive Director, with his attitude of it being a bipartisan effort, and that the process was sound and would perpetuate the kinds of issues that the network wanted to see brought to the forefront, he did not have the authority delegated to him that Congressman Waldie did.

Immediately the delegation of authority was withdrawn and he was given a lesser delegation of authority and had to report through various channels that took away the authority for him to operate and implement the whole concern about this being a bipartisan effort.

It also became evident very quickly that the idea that he had as to how this should be operated was not necessarily consistent with the administration's ideas.

Some of the things that he had to do in terms of following through had to deal with the advisory council. That change was made to reflect the new administration's view toward bringing in private sector and broadening the base of participation so that it wouldn't be just the aging network.

All of these things were thought of as compromises and things that were normal in a transition from a political standpoint when one administration is changed over and people would make some adjustment, make some compromise, but were not moving to a position of being blatantly political and partisan in an endeavor such as this.

Gradually things began to change. Several things began to impact on the Conference. The first thing was subsequent decisions made by the administration after the decision by the transition team made and after the new Executive Director was named and after the Conference began to move ahead.

These decisions were based around the budget cuts that this administration had implemented. It was also the block grant and the cuts in services that were implemented by the administration and the concerns and issues around social security.

These initiatives by the administration brought about responses from the aging network that they began to be cognizant of immediately. It became obvious that the responses from the senior groups and the aging networks throughout the country was not necessarily favorable to the initiatives of the administration.

This began to arouse some anxiety on the part of the administration, and this was reflected in the kind of directives given to the Director.

Another thing that impacted on the Conference was the fact that staff were brought in that were not aging network or gerontologically sound staff, a staff who had no substantial grounding in gerontology. They were brought in. They were political people who had worked in campaigns.

These staff began to infiltrate the conferences as they were assigned and began to impact on the Conference in such a way that they had a direct line to the political machinery in the White House, whereby Dave Rust and I had direct lines to the aging network as such.

Those two instances began to change the nature of the Conference and the nature of the staff that were involved.

I remained on and was asked to remain on the Conference and agreed to remain on because I thought we could move ahead and implement the kinds of things that Congressman Waldie had advanced.

Dave and I both thought we could do these things. I was asked to continue to do the things as we were doing it. As we began to do this, it became more and more difficult because of the nature of the people that were surrounding us and the nature of the reaction to the administrative policies.

We found ourselves in a constant battle, fighting to maintain the integrity of the Conference in a way that would enable us to accomplish these goals. As spelled out by the Congressman earlier, the test became not a test of loyalty to the aging network and the issues and concerns of the senior citizens as expressed throughout the miniconferences, State conferences, and the community forums that had been held, but the test became, because of this anxiety, a feeling that the administration would be vulnerable to a group coming into Washington and unanimously disapproving of the issues that had been advanced by the administration.

So the test did become one of loyalty to the administration as opposed to loyalty to the aging network and the issues of the aging individuals.

I am proud to say that I failed that test of loyalty to the administration. By attempting to maintain my loyalty to the aging network, Dave Rust and I failed that test and immediately became suspect of not being true implementers of the administration's program.

I think that it was the fact that we were not loyal to the administration's concerns and anxiety as opposed to loyalty to trying to implement an impartial conference that got us into the position where it was necessary to either go the way we wanted to go or remove us and to implement their desires.

I think it is a matter of history that we were both removed from the Conference at a crucial time so that the people could be brought in that could pass the loyalty test to the administration above other things and begin to implement the Conference in ways that could protect the administration from the alleged threat of the overwhelming attitude of the older persons being expressed in the Conference in such a way that would be inconsistent with the administration's desires, that would be against the desires of the administration, and not approve of the initiatives put forth by the administration.

I might add that Congressman Waldie did a good job of explaining the details of how that went about. I might support the fact, they did fail in attempting to totally control the Conference.

They did arouse the interests. It awakened a sleeping giant. But what I am concerned about is that some people are under the impression that the aging network and the aging individuals won by being able to get their issues and concerns in the forefront and into the recommendation package.

I would like to close by saying that there is still a war going on out there. That was just one battle. The issue is to not have not just 2,000 delegates, but not to have 32 million or a substantial portion of the older persons come out in such a way that the statements that they make are not supportive of the administration.

This is reflected not only at the Conference, but you will find this whole process was reflected in the post-Conference questionnaire that was developed. It was developed in such a way so as not to afford for a unanimous expression of views by the aging network and by the delegates to that Conference. Even now, as you look at it, you will see there is no way for that to be determined.

I think we have a series of recommendations out there now. It is like a barrel that anybody can reach into. At this point the administration can reach in and pull out anything it feels it wants to promote. But it also affords an opportunity for the aging network to begin to look in and pull out and prioritize the recommendations and promote what they want.

It puts Congress in the precarious position of being able to try to implement legislation that reflects the interests of the aging individuals, but also they will come head-on against the administration trying to implement the policies that they want to promote.

The key to this whole thing I think is how well the aging network is able to organize itself and to express its views and to be supportive of the congressional activities and actions in the kind of legislation that is going to be submitted early on.

So, I am encouraging this State to really get its act together and really try to determine what its issues and priorities are, and to be sure that you let Congress know what your concerns are and, if possible, think of joining forces with and forming coalitions with other States in developing regional type organizations so that the advocacy of the aging network can be felt.

Without that, anything can happen. If you allow yourselves to be lulled to sleep, you might find in a few months when the report comes out and bills are being introduced, they are not the kinds of things you would have picked out of this series of recommendations to implement. There was something in there for everybody. Now it is the strong ones and the ones best organized that are the ones going to prevail in this.

Thank you.

Mr. **Roybal**. Thank you, Mr. Harper.

Mr. Waldie, I would like to understand the process that you used in setting up the Conference. I want to know if it was based on the previous Conferences or whether it was a new concept altogether.

Mr. **Waldie**. In part it was based on previous Conferences. What we did, we looked at the two previous Conferences, the 1961 and 1971 Conferences, and we attempted to identify the weaknesses of those prior Conferences and the strengths, to reject the weaknesses and enhance the strengths.

The best answer to your question, Mr. Chairman, I think would be to say this was a unique new conference. It was essentially my idea that this was a political exercise, that people were legislators in effect.

The delegates in essence in the past came to Washington, as they did this time, gathered in great numbers with very little preparation, very little opportunity to prepare, no opportunity to interrelate with each other until they got there, no opportunity to be available for consultation within the areas from which they came and were to represent.

It was my view as a politician, and as a legislator, that we ought to devise a legislative construct for the Conference so that these delegates would become important people in their communities.

The results of their participation in the Conference would be more of a legislative product because the recommendations would be essentially to go to politicians for implementation. So, it was new in that sense, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Roybal**. The end result has been that the original format of the Conference was not put into place.

Mr. **Waldie**. Well, a lot of it fortunately was put into place before the Reagan administration came into office. A lot of it was implemented. We had gotten through the local forums. We had gotten through all of the miniconferences, 40 of those, that may have been the most important part.

Mr. **Roybal**. But the actual reports of the miniconferences were not made available to delegates.

Mr. **Waldie**. That is right.

Mr. **Roybal**. So there was not a complete implemention of the original process?

Mr. **Waldie**. That is right. That was in furtherance of the administration objective: If you can keep your delegates uninformed, unorganized, you control them.

Mr. **Roybal**. The miniconferences were held. But the regional meetings in September, however, were canceled. That cancelation resulted in almost a complete disassociation of delegates.

Mr. **Waldie**. That is exactly right. They never saw each other until they arrived in Washington, D.C.

Mr. **Roybal**. When the Conference was held, Mr. Harper, was there a circulation of projects or objectives of the Conference to any of the delegates?

Mr. **Harper**. Even up until the last few days of the Conference, the aging network was asking for and begging for a sense of what the issues were, who the people would be, what committees they would be on. This was withheld.

I wasn't there at the time, but my personal opinion is it was withheld deliberately in keeping with the policy that we didn't want to give out too much information, allow the delegates an opportunity to organize themselves into caucuses and so on.

Mr. **Roybal**. I ask that question because many delegates throughout the country complained that there was no opportunity to find out what the objectives of the Conference would be, with the exception of those objectives reached in the miniconferences.

I am trying to find whether the administration wanted the objectives reached by the miniconference.

Mr. **Waldie**. Mr. Chairman, there was a memo submitted by then Executive Director Rust to Secretary Schweiker to prepare the Secretary for the meeting with the chairman of the National Republican Committee when the Secretary was going to meet with the chairman who wanted the list that had been denied by Rust.

Rust has in that memo this paragraph.

> I have also attached a list of the organizations that have requested delegate lists to date. You will note from this list some of these groups will be organizing delegates to fight for additional spending in new programs. I have pursued a conscious policy of delaying for as long as possible the release of this list so as to protect the delegates from being inundated with material from dozens of different organizations.

It was clearly a conscious policy to keep the delegates uninformed.

Mr. **Roybal**. At a hearing held in Washington, where we had testimony from Mr. Richards, the committee was told that the surveys that were conducted, things that were done to the Conference, were all done to benefit the Republican National Committee.

So, there is admission from at least part of the administration this was done. I would like to find out what effect it had on the Conference. I think I know the effect that it had on the delegates as individuals. But the overall result of the Conference, how was that affected? There was disenchantment, no doubt, on the part of delegates. But we still had over 600 recommendations made.

I would like to get behind the scenes, if I possibly can. Maybe you can tell me what was said by delegates, what the reaction of the delegates was during the Conference and how that finally affected the wording of the recommendations.

I have read some of these recommendations, and they are not as strong as I would like to see them. Was there any attempt to water down the recommendations? These are the things that the committee would like to find out.

Mr. **Harper**. Briefly—and I know some of the delegates will go into this—just in following up on the concerns about the miniconference reports, they were read by the administration. Part of the reaction that was conveyed to the Conference staff was that the recommendations that came out of the State hearings in the miniconference reports were not consistent with this administration's views, and therefore it wouldn't be to their best interests to promote and disseminate these widely, and also to allow people to have them in time to begin to form caucuses to promote some of the issues that came out.

So, there was a conscious decision and a strong effort designed and strategy designed to try to promote a different kind of a set of recommendations that would be more consistent with the attitudes of this administration.

That is what led up to the other kinds of issues and concerns that will be brought out later.

Mr. **Roybal**. Originally there were 50 advisers in place, made up of experts in the field. They were fired; 50 new persons were placed in their positions.

Mr. **Waldie**. I don't think 50 new. I think—Leon could probably tell you.

Mr. **Harper**. Fifteen of the older members were retained.

Mr. **Roybal**. Fifteen of the original 50 were in place. Now, can you give us some idea of what the qualifications were of the new members? Were they in general as competent as the ones that were fired?

Mr. **Harper**. I might say that the efforts by Congressman Waldie were designed in such a way to bring to the forefront the foremost experts in the field of aging within this country regardless of their political affiliations. That was done, I think, and the best people were brought forth.

A lot of effort was put into that. When you remove these people, there were not that many substantively qualified persons left to pull in.

One of the strong issues of the administration was to bring in people who had a business and private sector orientation. So a strong segment of the new advisory council were picked from that corps of people—the business, private sector, corporate sector.

So, you will find a strong influx of those kinds of individuals with no substantive aging background at all.

Mr. **Roybal**. I asked that question because you stated in your testimony that the staff in general was not as capable as the original staff, it was made up primarily of political appointees. Does that describe pretty well the situation?

Mr. **Harper**. It describes the fact that the people picked were people who were known to the administration and their attitudes and sentiments were known, and they were in agreement.

Mr. **Roybal**. But not necessarily gerontologists and people with expertise in the field?

Mr. **Harper**. Correct. There were some that did, but that wasn't a primary concern.

Mr. **Roybal**. The committee can assume that the primary criteria in the appointment of those individuals was not necessarily background, but political loyalty.

Mr. **Harper**. That was one of the strong considerations. The other one was the orientation toward the private sector and the corporate sector, bringing in a new dimension. Because the aging network as such was viewed as the enemy, quote, because of the analysis of the aging network's previous work in the miniconferences and the reports, that they were not viewed as promoting the kinds of ideas that the administration wanted to see.

Mr. **Roybal**. I have many more questions to ask, but because of the limited time, I would like to ask just one more regarding social security.

Were the recommendations made by the delegates on the matter of social security adequate? Could they have been stronger? What is your evaluation of those recommendations?

Mr. **Waldie**. My own evaluation is limited by the fact that though I was at the Conference, I was not given any credentials to go into anything, so I had to stay in the hall. But I heard a lot and I read a lot about it, and I talked to the principles involved in it.

I think the administration succeeded to this degree in its effort to mute the voice of the conference on the social security issue. It muddied up that issue so badly by establishing the committee that handled that issue and forcing the kind of a confrontation that the chairman of your committee was engaging in, that the recommendation of the Conference on Social Security I think still played pretty much into the President's hands because the President can point to a number of recommendations as to the conference not coming out as strongly as an unfettered voice would have come out is my own view.

Mr. **Harper.** I might add that that was one of the primary concerns of individuals representing the administration, was that no very strong, unanimous views come out of this group and that from the standpoint of a couple of individuals, they could say, "Mission accomplished. We really walloped them. We didn't allow this group to come in and burden this administration with recommendations backed up by a lot of media coverage that would embarrass the President and force this administration to make moves in that direction."

So, I think that the recommendation that did come out were at best compromises that were won at great cost, with a lot of effort by a lot of people, just to gain those compromises. Those compromises are not necessarily fully representative of the views of the conference but the best that could be gotten under the circumstances.

Mr. **Roybal.** May I thank you, Mr. Waldie and Mr. Harper, for your testimony.

We have another panel we would like to hear from. We would like to have you remain, if you possibly can. There may be some further questions.

The next panel will be Janet Levy, Milton Tepper,
Betty Kozasa, and Fernando Torres-Gil.

Please come forward and take your seats.

The first witness will be Mrs. Janet Levy.

STATEMENT OF JANET LEVY, CALIFORNIA STATE DIRECTOR ON AGING, STATE COORDINATOR FOR 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mrs. **Levy.** Thank you, Mr. Roybal. I am Janet Levy, director of the California Department of Aging and State coordinator for the White House Conference for the Governor of California.

I would like to first thank Congressman Roybal and his staff, chiefly Mr. Lambrinos, for providing our office with the total committee breakdown of delegates.

If it had not been for the receipt of this invaluable material, California would have been unable to plan for caucus and subcommittee meetings held during available times of the Conference.

I think that is very, very important and should be known by all of us.

I would like to just, in response, and I don't want to repeat any of what Mr. Harper and Congressman Waldie have reiterated, but I would like to supplement some of the facts, as I see them, in assessing what happened to us.

The first regional training sessions were canceled. This was a real blow because we were going to be with 10 of the other Western

States at that time to get our act together, to really have a cooperative, collaborative effort, because in the West, we have some issues that are unique to this part of the country. We thought this was going to be an excellent opportunity. When they were canceled, we then arranged, and I say, "we," it was not only the steering committee headed up by Mr. Bodin in the northern area of the State, but his 11 members of the steering committee and other representatives, delegates and observers, who decided that we should have 3 regional workshops to make up for those training sessions that were canceled. So we immediately did that.

The next problem we had was in trying to get the committee assignments for the delegates and observers. I was told directly by the Office of the White House Conference that this would not be possible, that we would have to call each and every one of our over 300 participants to get their committee assignment, when they received that committee assignment.

I asked if that meant I had to make 300 individual telephone calls and they said yes. You can imagine the time and expense. If it had not been for receiving the material that I mentioned that Congressman Roybal's office was able to get for us—we then proceeded to send the entire list of delegates from the entire country out to each one of our participants so that they could find their own committee assignment, which was another task that was pretty ridiculous when we figured the time, the cost, the expense that this all resulted in.

You have heard already the problems that we had in gaining caucus and hospitality space. Throughout the early planning stages, we were informed by the Office of the White House Conference that we would not go directly to hotels to get space for caucusing, that we should do it through their office. So we abided by this. We said, "We will abide by the rules as you make them."

However, about 10 days before the Conference, we were informed by that office that we should then go directly to the hotels. By then, California, being distant from where we were going to make the arrangements, I mentioned it was like being fed to the wolves, because I really felt that we were at a disadvantage. And we were. We were told by both the Hilton and the Sheraton, one would charge $100 an hour for space, the other $200 an hour. If it had not been for the contribution that Levi-Strauss made of $500, we would not have had those two caucuses. It was very, very important that we have them, because we did have our observers and delegates pretty well together.

Unfortunately, the system for allowing people to know about these caucuses after we got there, the bulletin boards were not always able to be found, they were not always as clearly indicated. And so many of our participants were not present at those two caucuses.

However, we did have a hospitality room. I would like to mention publicly here the very fine gentleman from Santa Rosa, Mr. Robert Kerr, contributed $2,000 for that hospitality room, which we again would not have been able to have. It was a place for the people who were staying at the other hotel, the Hilton, to get together, to rest a bit, to be able to have a home away from home. And so we were able to get through with that problem. But it could have been a really grave problem for all of us had we not had these two contributions.

The most recent thing that has happened, and I would like to mention this very definitely—we had some 83 delegates-at-large in the last 6 weeks assigned to the California delegation. I called the White House Conference Office and was told that we would be getting a list of those new people. We originally—when Mr. Rust was still the Executive Director—were given the names of 23 of those recently appointed delegates at large.

I still to this day do not have the additional 60 names. And when I wrote the Executive Director of the White House Conference on December 8, I asked Betty Drake if she would send me this list. We were going to do some followup work, and we wanted to have the names so no one would be left out.

She did not respond to my letter. So on December 31, I thought it was a good way to end the old year, I called her personally and spoke with her. She did not seem to be aware of my letter. She asked me the date I had written it. She said, "It might be here in a stack of mail on my desk and will be acted upon very quickly."

I have still to this day not heard. We still are missing the names of those last 60 delegates at large who will not be informed and will not get the mailings we have already sent out.

During the two caucuses, the decision was made that we should send a duplicate copy to the office of the State department of aging to duplicate the list of the response, the ballot, questionnaire, call it what you will, they were going to be sending back to the White House Conference.

We went to the additional expense of sending out a stamped, addressed envelope that those questionnaires, the duplicates, should be sent to our office. Someone said, "It sounds like you don't trust the Feds," and someone else said, "We don't."

I said, however, we really want to get the material as quickly as possible because we are in the second year of a State legislature, and if there is any legislation that we can act upon quickly, we would like to know it as soon as we can.

That is the overall reason. But perhaps it is again that we don't always trust the other side of the road.

I would like to just end my few remarks at this time by saying that we have had such wonderful cooperation from our congressional offices. Senator Cranston's office has been extremely helpful to us in getting some of the information we need. We are going to continue to follow up.

We will be having area meetings with our people who will be representing the areas of the State that were delegates and observers as well. We know we have not lost the war. Maybe we have lost a battle or two, but not the war.

[The prepared statement of Janet Levy follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JANET J. LEVY, DIRECTOR, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF AGING

I am Janet J. Levy, director of the California Department of Aging and State White House Conference on Aging coordinator for the Governor. Before giving my responses to the conference in general, I would like to thank Congressman Roybal and his staff, chiefly Jorge Lambrinos, for providing my office with a copy of the total original committee breakdown for delegates. If it had not been for the receipt of this invaluable material, California would have been unable to plan for caucus and subcommittee meetings which were held during the available times at the conference.

In spite of the varied and often negative press, some excellent things have come out of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging, in my observation as the coordinator for the California delegation. As most of you know, ten Western States drew together in the formation of a western caucus which was originally held in Scottsdale, Ariz., during September. That two-day meeting was followed by another meeting which was held on Sunday morning in Washington, D.C., before the afternoon commencement of the formal activities of the conference. In this way, the Western States spoke pretty much as one voice and will continue to formulate their plans for administrative and legislative action taking place within each individual State.

A strong unification between States was shown through the presentation of and support for priority issues. This unification was evidenced through the broad visibility and recognition that older people, their needs and goals, have come into their own as a force which must be recognized by communities throughout the Nation.

Success of such conferences cannot be immediately measured. Several years are required for changes to become effective through the legislative process. Historical perspective provides evidence of this. At the 1961 White House Conference the primary issues were medicare and medicaid, the Older Americans Act, and direct funding for housing. However, it was not until 1965 that these programs were implemented as a result of legislation.

The 1971 Conference generated refinements in the Older Americans Act, principally the addition of a nutrition component which first became evident with the establishment of nutrition sites in 1973. The Federal minimum income program, known as supplemental security income, became a reality in 1974.

The 1981 Conference was significantly timely as the need to maintain and supplement existing programs has become critical because of local and Federal fiscal constraints.

The results of this Conference were accomplished, without any doubt, under trying circumstances. California had the largest and most vocal group of delegates and observers—over 320 in all. This final number was up from the original 218 who were the representatives appointed early enough to receive training and orientation here in California prior to going to Washington, D.C. Parliamentary procedures were stressed which often provided the tools necessary for Californians to make a strong and impressive impact in the individual committee meetings of which they were members.

In spite of the negative publicity and distorted rumors about California's delegation, the first action taken by our caucus was to announce the intention that these delegates would stay at the Conference, they would not walk out. We had not traveled 3,000 miles to walk away from an opportunity to voice the recommendations and concerns of California's 3½ million persons over 60 years of age.

Certainly there were problems at the Conference and they fell relatively into three categories:

First, the format of the Conference itself. There was an almost total change in staff just six weeks before the Conference. This caused numerous voids. Information provided in a timely manner could have provided a more informed group of delegates and observers. Upon inquiring as to the availability of California's committee assignments, I was told by the office in Washington that the assignments would be given only to each individual delegate and observer. If our office required the complete list of committee assignments, we should call each one of those individuals—imagine what a time-consuming and expensive effort it would have been to make over 300 calls! It was at this time that Mr. Lambrinos provided our office with the national listing of committee assignments for delegates, which we then mailed to each one of our delegates and observers for their use.

Also, many delegates were not given their choice of committee; hence, they were unable to prepare themselves with the needed subject material for discussion in the committees. Distribution of background material was very late. The sessions themselves were hampered by the tardy distribution of Conference rules which had been developed without participant input. What Conference rules were distributed were interpreted differently in each committee. For example, while all observers were to have had the right to speak; not all committees permitted this.

Second, many of the delegates were unable to carry out their original plan for sharing rooms because of the changes made due to committee/hotel assignments. There were also many observers who had paid for meal tickets but records were unavailable so that numbers of them did not receive appropriate refunds upon their request.

And third, lack of desirable accommodations failed to provide for an effective working environment. Caucus space was not available except at the last moment and at a dear price of $100 to $200 an hour. No microphones were placed on the floor of the large conference rooms used for the plenary sessions which prevented delegates from effectively participating. During the last session, delegates and observers were assigned seats by committee in direct opposition to the usual "states together" arrangement. However, many of the delegates of different States managed to sit with their "state-mates," thereby forming a strong, supportive coalition among those States who had planned to voice their objection to the voting routine. An interesting observation shows that California was not proportionately represented on the key committees such as economic well-being, implications for the economy of an aging population, health care and services, options for long-term care, and housing alternatives. On each of these major committees only 10 or 12 Californians were assigned. On other committees, Californians had 20–25 delegates.

To assure that all the valuable information which came out of the 14 committee hearings is made available to the California delegation, we have asked all participants to send us a copy of their response to the White House Conference's "ballot" questionnaire. Our department has provided a stamped return envelope for this purpose. We hope from this, local agencies and the State legislature may take necessary action to address the recommendations made by those attending the conference. In this way, California will continue to follow up the national Conference through its steering committee and total delegation activities which will be continued under the direction of the department of aging.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you, Mrs. Levy.

The next witness, Mr. Milton Tepper.

STATEMENT OF MILTON TEPPER, VICE CHAIRMAN, CITY OF LOS ANGELES COUNCIL ON AGING

Mr. TEPPER. Thank you. My name is Milton Tepper. I was cochairman of the Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County Regional Conference. I am now vice chairman of the Los Angeles Council on Aging of the area agency on aging.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier that the last time we met was in the dark. Many of these people remember. Two years ago we started working diligently. I think it is important to know that those 4 days did not happen by themselves.

The city and county worked together very closely. We sponsored over 200 community forums, ranging from 5 people to hundreds of people, resulting in recommendations to go forth 2 years later to the White House Conference.

Almost a year ago in January, in the auditorium at the University of Southern California—now you remember—I was chairing, and you were our keynote speaker. The power was off, but I can't blame that on the administration.

You set aside your prepared speech, since there was only one small light on the rostrum, and you said, "I cannot read this, so I will mail it out to all of you and then you can write back and tell me if it was a good speech."

I never received my copy. Nevertheless, you came up with a very inspiring speech, telling us how important our work was and that we should go forward. Also what we were doing was necessary so that the Congress would know and be able to act on what the people really needed and wanted.

We did go on. There was a State house conference. Mrs. Levy and the Governor made it possible for us to achieve something. There were the miniconferences. I was out of the room and this may not have been mentioned before.

At each of these conferences, we had to select the most important items under a particular heading, whether it was health, transportation, education, employment, and so forth. You did not include everybody's views. You voted and picked what was most important, and my understanding is that that is the way that the White House Conference was supposed to be. We were supposed, under each committee, to come up with the most important resolutions for that topic.

Well, we went.

Mr. Waldie mentioned committee assignments. I did not hear him say we did not get our committee assignments until about a week before we left. So it was not only that we didn't know what we were going to do, but we could not study, work, and/or consult in advance.

Mr. Waldie mentioned the Technical Committee's work. That was a year's work that was never given to us. They did send us a package of booklets on the various subjects; on all of the subjects so that everything was covered, because we didn't have our committee assignments at that time. But they didn't tell us that these were the reports of the Technical Committee or that they even existed.

For me it was particularly thrilling to return to Washington. I was born and raised there. I had not been there in over 20 years. All of the delegates from California went with enthusiasm that we were going to accomplish something.

Well, shortly after we got there a few things came up. No. 1, the rule that you could not break down into subcommittees. And every committee consisted of 150 or more. I am sure other people will cover this later. But that prohibited us from doing anything efficiently.

And then, the press seemed to have done a pretty good job. I am quoting from a letter on the stationery of the office of the Governor of Texas, signed by his department director of personal appointments, to Mrs. Betty Hillman.

> DEAR BETTY: Here is the list of delegates to the White House Conference on Aging. There are only four of them marked with an asterisk who would put loyalty to the President ahead of their commitment to the elderly, and who would not take offense on the involvement of the Republican Party.

When we saw that in the paper, it brought back a memory—a very bitter one. Growing up in Washington was a wonderful thing. We associated with Senators and Representatives, with their staffs, with the bureaucracy. We knew a great deal, more than most citizens of the country. But regarding our own problems although, we were allowed to talk and discuss, come election day there was no vote. It was a very frustrating feeling, knowing that you knew the answers to your problems, but could do nothing about them.

Now it is true that we did know who made the decisions. There was a small group of people, the Senate District of Columbia Committee and the House District of Columbia Committee. And it was rather like benevolent dictatorship or absentee ownership. "You can talk about your problems, but we will tell you what to do."

All of a sudden this feeling began to come back to me. We could talk all we want, but they are going to tell us what we are going to do.

Then, when the ballot came out, this little volume here, 668 resolutions, Mr. Harper has already commented on the fact we have something in there for everybody. They average, I think, 42 or so per committee—they didn't tell you to rate them as to which is the most important of the 42.

That is not in our instructions. We are supposed to do all of this by January 22, by the way. So the result will be meaningless.

I "like" the resolution that says at the next conference 10 years hence we should be invited to the White House. That is very interesting, but what does it have to do with legislation?

Another bit that the press came up with, and this is unmarked, is a delegate analysis. Now, in Committee No. 4, which is on wellness, which is not a particularly debatable point, they show favorable 11, not favorable, 49. But, go to Committee No. 5, which had to do with national health insurance, favorable 94; not favorable, 32. We did not get a good motion on national health insurance.

So if I have sounded less than enthusiastic so far, I don't want it to close that way. This is what I wrote for our local paper:

> Nevertheless, I feel that much good did come out of this conference. In addition to the important resolutions passed, I believe the people of this Nation became more knowledgeable and interested in the problems of the older adult. Most important, we met so many people from each of the States and territories who are knowing and caring individuals and who are willing to work for the benefit of the senior population.

Now, with the help of Mrs. Levy, we are starting already. If you will excuse me, I will make an announcement. Monday, the 11th, the delegates from Los Angeles City and County and the observers, and anybody else who cares to come, are invited to Saint Sophia's for a meeting regarding the resolutions, the ideas, and how we can proceed.

Mrs. Levy has told us that with the help of Governor Brown the rest of the State is also going to continue to try to do something. We are not going to let it fall by the wayside. Now we need your help and the Members of the Congress to guide us and help us.

We are going still further. Many of these resolutions affect this State. I am local caucus chairman for the city and county, California State Legislature. We are meeting next Thursday, same place, to discuss which of those resolutions regarding State legislation are worthwhile, and proceed to go ahead with them.

We trust that you, your committee and the Congress, will give us the leadership we need—because, bluntly, we did not feel that we got it from any place but Congressmen when we were in Washington.

There is one thing I want to mention. Even with a bitter memory of impotence, not being able to vote in Washington, we at least knew who was making the rules—the District Committee. But here, Mr. Waldie and Mr. Harper have hinted, we don't know who "they" were, the ones who said you cannot break up into subcommittees; "they," the ones who said you do not get the technical reports unless you go to the library and ask for them, et cetera.

Many of us didn't even get the rules in our packet when we arrived. We had to wait a couple of days and ask other people where to get them. Who "they" were, we don't know. But they surely operated very, very efficiently in keeping us in the dark. So now I am back to the dark again.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **ROYBAL**. Thank you, Mr. Tepper.

The next witness is Mrs. Kozasa.

STATEMENT OF BETTY KOZASA, CHAIRMAN, ASIAN PACIFIC RESOURCE CENTER ON AGING, AND CHAIRMAN, LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL ON AGING

Mrs. **KOZASA**. Congressman Roybal, I am Betty Kozasa. I chair the National Asian Pacific Resource Center on Aging. I am chairman of the Los Angeles City Council on Aging, which is the advisory body to the Los Angeles City Area Agency on Aging.

I was a gubernatorial appointee to the White House Conference on Aging.

In retrospect, as I think back on the preparations, the homework that we did for for the White House Conference on Aging, I think that generally our expectations were muted. I think that our expectations were lower than those delegates who attended the 1961 and 1971 Conferences.

Taking into consideration the climate of Washington at this time, taking into consideration the great gains that were made after the 1961 and 1971 White House Conferences on Aging, we thought if we could maintain what we had, that would be doing pretty well.

During pre-Conference, people preceding me have alluded to and made direct comments on the lack of assignments to key issues, the no honoring of requests to issues that people wanted. The survey itself was disquieting, and the voting procedure was, we felt, unfair.

As Milton said, we did not have the rules of the game prior to our leaving home. The lateness in receiving background materials; the changes in key staff; the appointment of additional delegates were troublesome.

This is a sample of the litany of complaints I am sure you are going to hear throughout the day.

I personally had difficulty. I did not receive my airline ticket or bus ticket. I felt thoroughly discriminated against. But I managed to get there, despite this great hardship.

During the Conference—I am sure you have heard of the wonderful buffet reception the first evening. We were placed in the basement of the Sheraton Hotel. And there were 2,000 of us running around with 6-inch paper plates trying to get our dinner.

Again, I felt personally discriminated against, because that night I almost died of ptomaine poisoning. The following morning my roommate said to me, "You look pretty green around the edges, I don't think you ought to go to the plenary session."

I said, "I may be, but I am going to the plenary session."

Well, the issue I was assigned to was "Older Americans as a National Resource." There were about 200 of us, I think, in each one of these groups. The issues were too broad. There were too many of us in each one of the issues to really do a good job of discussion.

On top of that, more than anything else I think I resented the imposing of inept leadership. Morris Better will confirm this, because he and I were in the same issue. We had such thoroughly inept leadership. We gave this man on-the-job training. He didn't understand parliamentary procedure. He certainly did not understand the aging network. He didn't understand the jargon.

Every little group has its own jargon. Lord knows, the aging network has its jargon.

Then we had a State senator from Florida who came and he addressed the issue of the elderly continuing their work passed retirement age, or current retirement age. And he said something about, "Let the elderly work, give them $2 an hour, it is better than nothing, isn't it?" Gee, that was a great setting for that particular issue.

We didn't receive a printed agenda until 5 p.m. the first day. The leader gave us two more printed agendas the following day. He needed help. And we tried to help him.

Then the following day he realized if we continued to discuss each motion, each recommendation, each resolution, we would run out of time. So he said, "How would it be if we did away with all discussion and amendments and clarifying and just vote all the resolutions, motions, up or down?"

So that is the way it went. I thoroughy resented that entire exercise.

If the White House Conference on Aging is a vehicle to unite older persons and service providers in advocating for individual and group needs and concerns, then I think the White House Conference on Aging fulfilled its role. Delegates made contacts with counterparts from all over the Nation and we have kept in touch since the Conference.

We coalesced, we chatted, we talked in the hallways, in hotel rooms, all over. And we continue to talk.

Out of this will develop a strong national network which will advocate for the elderly. And it will have a ripple effect. Each person who was a delegate or an observer has a constituency at home. And the network will closely watch Congress and work with Congress as allies.

As Leon said, the administration can pull out of the hat any recommendation that it wants to support. It can also do the opposite. It can torpedo a recommendation that it doesn't want to support. I think we, as delegates and observers, can be selective and we advocate for the recommendations that we want to see pushed through. And we want the help of Congress in order to do this.

Is the White House Conference the very best mechanism to plan for the needs of the elderly? I thought about this a little bit. I am not a great thinker. I tend to be very flighty. But I have thought about this since I came home.

What is the best mechanism to plan for the need of the elderly in this Nation? Some of the delegates said we need a White House Conference on Aging every 3 years. Others have said every 5 years. Can we afford to spend $6 million each time and plan for it 3 years in advance?

My query is: In view of dwindling resources can we realistically expect another White House Conference on Aging in 1991? Instead, should we concentrate on a localized approach to the problems of the elderly, where regional conferences could be funded?

Do we have to make national recommendations—when there is really no means for implementing some of the recommendations?

Could there be hundreds of local policies tailored to the needs of the local population?

For example, the needs and concerns of the Asian Pacific elderly are not really addressed outside of the west coast, New York, and Chicago, where there are enclaves of Asian and Pacific island peoples. People from North Carolina have said, "What Asian and Pacific elderly?" Despite this enlightened time, 1982, there are some folks in this Nation who think that all Asians speak the same language, that there is a common language. They still think that we all know each other, that we all love each other. That is not so, just as all Europeans do not love each other.

There is a general myth in the United States that if you speak French you are cultured, and if you speak Spanish you are disadvantaged, but if you speak Chinese you are thoroughly impossible. There is that kind of attitude throughout the land.

I am just wondering if this is the best use of our moneys.

Could we strengthen the Administration on Aging, not let it be buried where it is?

Can we strengthen the Older Americans Act?

Can we strengthen the area agencies on aging and increase the funding for the Older American Volunteer programs?

Can we empower the available national support system to provide the bulk of services to the aging, whether it be the family, whether it be the neighborhood group, or an agency? Is that a better use of our money?

I am doubtful at this time.

In retrospect, I think it is good that the 2,000 delegates and the 1,000 observers went to Washington. We came home much better informed. We are much more politically aware.

Many of us came home with righteous anger. If we can translate that frustration and anger into action, then the White House Conference will truly have fulfilled its role. But we need the help of Congress to continue in advocating for the elderly.

Thank you.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you, Mrs. Kozasa.

Our next witness is Mr. Fernando Torres-Gil.

STATEMENT OF FERNANDO TORRES-GIL, PROFESSOR OF GERONTOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. TORRES-GIL. Congressman Roybal, I am Fernando Torres-Gil. I would like to mention a few things about my experiences at the Conference. I was a delegate from Los Angeles County. I was on the Committee on the Public Sector. I was also a former member on the Federal Council on Aging up until 2 weeks before the Conference, which struck me as somewhat unusual to get rid of that whole body at that time.

I was also a delegate to the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, which provides me an historical perspective. I would like to share a few comments regarding the conference.

White House Conferences on Aging are among many different types of White House conferences on different types of areas. But over the last 30 years they have become the most important and the most productive. The 1961 White House Conference on Aging, for example, indirectly resulted in the creation of medicare, the Older Americans Act, as well as the Administration on Aging.

The 1971 White House Conference on Aging resulted in such programs as title VII nutrition, which is now title III under the Older Americans Act. It resulted in the creation of the supplemental security income program and the National Institute on Aging. As we can see, these conferences are important.

The first two had one thing in common. Regardless of specific problems they may have had in the operation of those conferences, there was open, democratic participation. I mean democratic with a small "d." People had access, people could say what they wished, people felt they had some input in the operations of the conference.

And even under the Nixon Administration, President Nixon was supportive and certainly its chairman, Arthur Fleming, was very supportive and flexible with any of the requests from the delegates.

We have heard about the various problems attached to the 1981 White House Conference on Aging, the manipulation, circumvention of the grassroots organizing which went on for up to 2 years, the total lack of leadership and other problems.

The Conference, by the way, reminds me of a family reunion, where you attend and find that it is being run by total strangers. You have no input into your own family reunion, so you try to make the best of it and enjoy yourself. I think in many ways this White House Conference on Aging reflects this.

Now we have received the ballots which, on the surface are supposed to be the official closure of this whole 3-year long process. We are supposed to give our final votes, our final tabulation of the recommendations that we support or do not support.

Knowing a little bit about research, I can probably say that the ballot and the survey attached to it could not have been any worse than if they had been done by some child in the sixth grade. We don't know what to do with it. Clearly they are not going to computerize their responses or come up with any coherent set of tabulations or categorization of the responses.

I wonder if in fact these ballots are simply going to sit in somebody's office. I have this feeling that the final report may reflect what others feel, not necessarily what the responses are on these ballots.

In spite of all these problems, I was pleased to see that the delegates or the majority of the delegates prevailed—in spite of all the barriers and the constraints, the majority of the delegates who were truly representative, having come up into the process and the procedures, established by the former Director, Jerome Waldie, and the Deputy Director, Leon Harper, were able to come up with what I felt were a series of significant and progressive recommendations which clearly represent the viewpoint of many older persons in this country and if taken seriously can result in meaningful programs even in spite of the scarce resources which we are now facing.

This leads me I think to the primary focus of my testimony, and that has to do with the followup steps. What can we do, what can we recommend to insure or at least raise the probability that something will come of this Conference—not necessarily the types of concrete accomplishments of the previous White House conferences but something that will make our time worthwhile, the $6 million plus worthwhile, something that reflects the extraordinary energy that went into it. And with that, I would like to end by presenting a series of recommendations that I would hope will be considered.

My first recommendation has to do with the ballot and the final tabulation. Janet Levy has recommended that the various State units on aging, the State offices throughout the country, be able to review the final ballots and also have their own copies. I strongly support that recommendation. I would hate to see some outside body obtain these responses, however poorly they are constructed, and come up with their own interpretation.

I recommend that our California Department on Aging and other States units on aging receive copies for their particular States and the responses that are sent in.

Second, I would recommend that all of us continue the organizing and the tremendous unity which occurred at that Conference. And I am pleased to see that Mrs. Levy and the Governor's office are going to conduct a series of meetings to follow up with the work that has already been accomplished.

Following that, I would like to recommend some type of legislative oversight. The White House Conference on Aging is not a "White House" idea. It is an idea that was put across by the Congress and instituted as part of various pieces of aging legislation, and therefore the Congress has every right, and this is my recommendation, to establish an oversight body, a monitoring group perhaps through the House Select Committee on Aging or a joint effort with the Senate Committee on Aging that will examine the followup, will conduct periodic reports on what actually happens to those recommendations, and will report back to the various delegates.

I think that is our most reliable source of oversight, and I would encourage any type of process, whether it is a legislative committee, a citizens advisory board or whatever.

Within that, I would also like to recommend that the Congress mandate that the Federal Council on Aging, which is the key advisory body in aging, to participate in this oversight. This was initially their charge. However, it was circumvented with the firing of the Federal Council on Aging members just 2 weeks prior to the Conference.

Given that many of the recommendations, at least the ones I consider good, will ultimately have to be implemented through the various Cabinet agencies, I would also recommend that the Conference mandate that the various Cabinet departments and Cabinet secretaries assign staff to review the recommendations and list those that fall under their jurisdiction, to determine which are feasible in the short run and which may be feasible in the long run, and that they submit a report within a certain specified time period, let's say as an example 90 days, to the Congress, and, for example, the House Select Committee on Aging, on their review of those recommendations.

I would also like to recommend a resolution that came out of my public sector workshop, that the Congress enact legislation by which a selected number of older persons participate at a national conference or a regional conference in 1986, to review the actions taken that fulfill the resolutions of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging.

Finally, a few recommendations for my own State and my own State legislature. I think on a State level there should also be some type of legislative oversight. In California it could be under the auspices of the California Department On Aging, the specific legislative committees on aging, or perhaps a commission on aging. But I feel that we also should, on a State level, examine the report, determine which are particular for California, and through our own State level activities, insure that these recommendations do not disappear or that they are not ignored.

Congressman Roybal, I thank you for the opportunity to testify. I will certainly lend my support to whatever activities result from this hearing.

Mr. ROYBAL. I thank you, Mr. Torres-Gil, for your testimony, and the excellent recommendations you have made. Will you please tell the committee what your occupation is?

Mr. TORRES-GIL. I am a professor at the University of Southern California. I teach gerontology and public administration.

Mr. ROYBAL. These are recommendations you are making as a gerontologist?

Mr. TORRES-GIL. Yes. And having had experience within cabinet government and as an administrator.

Mr. ROYBAL. I wanted to get that into the record. I wanted to be sure the recommendations made are coming from an individual with expertise in his field. One of the things you mentioned was the fact that the conference was a family reunion run by strangers. I am going to ask other delegates if they feel that is a true description of the conference.

Mrs. Levy, some of the things I have heard this morning are hard to believe. It is hard to believe, first of all, that the conference of delegates was held in the Nation's Capital and no space was provided for caucuses. I have been going to conferences practically all my life. I went to conferences as a social worker, health educator. I went into the political arena. I never attended a conference that didn't provide space for a caucus.

I want to be sure that I understand what you told me. You have said no space was provided by the conference for caucuses, but that space was available on a rental basis.

Mrs. LEVY. Exactly.

Mr. ROYBAL. It was available to delegates who could afford to pay $100 an hour for the conference room. Is that correct?

Mrs. LEVY. Yes, or $200.

Mr. ROYBAL. So the fee was anywhere from $100 to $200 per caucus room, per hour. And usually a caucus cannot be held in 1 hour. So when the opportunity was made available for a caucus to be held, it was in fact held, but the delegates had to pay for it?

Mrs. LEVY. Not only that, Mr. Roybal, but the Western Caucus, which met Sunday morning, the 10 Western States that had met in Arizona in September, we had to take up a collection and pay for it right out of the attendees at that caucus. That was held over at the other, at the Shoreham Hotel.

Mr. ROYBAL. Which means that senior citizens, most of whom are on a fixed income, went to a caucus and still had to pay for the space at a cost that they could not afford.

Mrs. LEVY. Exactly.

Mr. ROYBAL. Another thing I cannot understand is the statement that I think you made with regard to the executive directors. How many executive directors did the Conference have outside of Mr. Waldie?

Mrs LEVY. Mr. Rust, and the present Executive Director, Mrs. Brake.

Mr. ROYBAL. In other words, in addition to Mr. Waldie there were two executive directors.

Mrs. LEVY. Yes, with almost totally new staff. I believe that Ms. Jo Harris and Mr. Jerome Kiefer are the only two of the original. They are the only two original staff people left there. And the other thing that I did not mention was that we were in direct contact with Mashman & Associates on any of the physical kind of arrangements and the transportation and all, and sometimes it was almost impossible after the departure of Mr. Rust to even make contact, to find out information for some of our people who wanted to make earlier plans, so they were going to stay over through the holidays at their own expense and come back. We had no cooperation in these areas at all.

Mr. ROYBAL. My understanding is that the only person who was a carryover was Mr. Harper.

Mrs. LEVY. When Mr. Harper was released from his responsibilities, we happened to have a slot under the Governor's appointments for an observer, and immediately the Governor appointed Leon Harper as a California observer. Someone in California resisted this and said Mr. Harper was no longer a resident of California. I quickly corrected this by saying he still owns property in California, he votes in California, and he is still a Californian, and I think will ever be.

Mr. ROYBAL. One other thing that puzzles me is that a statement was made that the rules dictated that no subcommittees be formed, which meant that there was no opportunity for a small group of men and women to get together to discuss a particular subject matter. Is that correct?

Mrs. LEVY. None whatsoever, exactly. Those that did, did it completely on their own, in their own rooms. And this was very, very difficult, because the time was not really allowed to do this.

Mr. ROYBAL. Another puzzling thing was that there was a grading of some kind made with regard to national health, in which delegates were rated as favorable and nonfavorable. Someone said that 94 percent were favorable and 32 percent were unfavorable in one particular instance. I would like to have that clarified, if anyone on the panel can do that for me. I would like to know how that came about, and what side was the favorable versus the unfavorable? Also, to whom were these people favorable, to the delegates, to Congress?

Mr. **Harper**. I think I would like to answer that, and one question earlier, about the caucusing. When I was acting in my official capacity, we had negotiated with the hotel for all of the space not being used by the committees between 6 a.m. and 12 o'clock midnight—any time they were not being used for official activities of the committee were available to any group to caucus. We had made that arrangement. I had developed a policy that had been approved. We were ready to send out to all of the organizations asking them to state their interest. After I was removed there was another policy that said no rooms were available, the hotel didn't have any, and the only way to get a room was to purchase the time. So somebody made a conscious decision to not allow caucusing, because that would have perpetuated or given impetus to the desires of the delegates to get themselves together and to have their will prevail at the Conference.

The second part you asked about was the favorable and unfavorable. This was based on the concept that there was a strong fear if the 2,000 delegates came together and expressed their will, that they would be against the administration. So they were frantically seeking to find people who could reverse that in very specific committees. They wanted to find people they could depend on to be supportive of the administration.

Several efforts were made in-house. As you know, the survey was made to try to get a handle on who some of the people would be that would be favorable, so they would know who they could depend on, and what committees they could put them on.

There was another issue. The document presented to you—I am looking at one right now—on the last day of the Conference when this document came out, about 12 of us were sitting around. We noticed something else here. It said "green (A, B, C)." We realized when we compared the favorable and unfavorable individuals on the list to the color coding, we realized that the Conference delegates were color coded, so they know who the friends and enemies were by who were walking around the hallways—that green was less favorable, and beige was—"A" was amber and "B" was blue—was unfavorable. And the unfavorable leadership was yellow. And this was a color coding system. As we were sitting looking, comparing, people had their badges on and were shocked to realize they knew all along that I was a friend or enemy.

And Dr. Fleming happened to have been in this group and he looked at his. And he was a less favorable one. He was shocked. He was blue and he realized he was a less favorable candidate.

Mr. **Roybal**. What color was "favorable"?

Mr. **Harper**. Amber.

Mr. **Roybal**. That was 94 percent?

Mr. **Harper**. That depended on the committee.

Mr. **Tepper**. I may have used the word "percentage." It was 94 people, which was 51.2 percent, versus 32 people not favorable.

Mr. **Roybal**. And that made up the national health——

Mr. **Tepper**. Committee No. 5.

Mr. **Roybal**. Committee No. 5 was made up of 94 favorable and 32 unfavorable.

Mr. **Tepper**. And 58 not identified.

Mr. **Roybal**. All identified by means of a color code.

Mr. **Harper**. Yes.

Mr. **Roybal**. Something was said to the effect that the expectations of the delegates were muted and lowered.

Ms. **Kozasa**. Yes.

Mr. **Roybal**. How do you feel about the future? How do you feel about the recommendations made? Do you feel that the expectations of the delegates and the senior citizens of this Nation will continue to be muted and lowered?

Ms. **Kozasa**. I think it is up to us who were the delegates and observers to pick up on those recommendations that we favor and get the rest of the aging network to help us in seeing that Congress will then act on it. I don't think that my expectations were lowered as to the activities after the Conference. I think it was my feeling prior to the Conference that we were not going to make great gains.

Mr. **Roybal**. One of the purposes of this hearing is to find out what happened at the Conference, have it recorded, and hope that the record of what happened can help future conference planners to avoid the same mistakes. But then the main objective is to make recommendations to the full committee and to the Congress. For example, Mr. Tepper has already said that a meeting would be held this coming Monday, the purpose of which will be to evaluate and prioritize the various recommendations, and make them available to the Congress of the United States.

The next thing is the action that the Congress may take with regard to those recommendations and whatever can be done to get the administration to help in the implementation of the recommendations made. The latter thing may be the most difficult of all. But nevertheless, I think that the wishes of the delegates can well be expressed by having meetings not only in Los Angeles, but throughout the State of California and throughout the Nation. Is that one of the recommendations that has already been made by the delegates, and if so, will you tell the committee what your plans are with regard to a followup procedure.

Mrs. **Levy**. I would like to respond to that. A strong unification between the States was shown through the presentation of and support for priority issues. This unification was evidenced through the broad visibility and recognition that older people, their needs and goals have come into their own as a force which must be recognized by communities throughout the Nation. This was evident. And this was one of the reasons that we had the Western Caucus. And we did speak as one voice for the Western States.

Such conferences cannot be measured immediately, as we have seen in the past.

I attended the 1961 and the 1971 Conferences. And it was almost 5 years before the actual legislation that was recommended at those Conferences really was enacted and took place. But we are going to continue as one strong voice. I know we will.

Mr. **Roybal**. I am glad to hear that. The committee needs a great deal of support. And that support has to come from the senior citizens of the United States. If the delegates were content just to visit Washington and then go home and forget it, then the Conference was not worthwhile. A followup must take place. The Congress of the United States must involve itself in the implementation of recommendations that you have made. Because if it does not, then a future conference in the same category would not be worthwhile.

One more statement with regard to your position, and then we are going to go on to another panel.

Mr. **Harper**. Just one comment in relation to the followup. You remember that if it took 5 years in favorable circumstances, in a report written by gerontologists—if it took 5 years to do it under favorable circumstances, don't be overoptimistic and think under unfavorable circumstances you are going to get anything at all, and especially under 5 years. If the report is going to be written by people not involved in the field of aging, not gerontologists, and have no interest in issues and concerns that have been expressed by the delegates, I think you are going to find it is going to be a hard way to go.

So the extent to which you can organize yourselves at the State level, on a regional basis, and form coalitions with other parts of the country to make your views heard and back them up with and support Congress will be the extent to which you will get some of these issues implemented in legislation.

Mr. **Roybal**. Your statement can be summarized by a statement made by another of the delegates who said we must translate our anger into action.

All right, let's do that. After this hearing is over, we must reevaluate our position. What happened at the Conference should not happen again. We must work together to be sure that we do in fact translate our anger into action. And let's try to do it in a coordinated manner.

I thank you for your testimony.

At this point we will recess for about 5 or 10 minutes. Then we will reconvene. Thank you very much.

[Recess.]

Mr. **Roybal**. Ladies and gentlemen, the committee will reconvene.

The committee will continue its hearing by hearing the third panel, made up of Janet Levy, Carmela Lacayo, Andy Gutierrez, and Dr. Robert Ruby.

We will hear once again from Janet Levy, who will start out the discussion. Next will be Carmela Lacayo, then Andy Gutierrez, and then Dr. Ruby.

STATEMENT OF JANET LEVY, CALIFORNIA STATE DIRECTOR ON AGING, AND STATE COORDINATOR FOR 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mrs. **Levy**. I would like to start by noting one thing that I failed to indicate at the previous session.

There is a very fine report titled the "Chart Book on Aging in America," which was originally planned when Mr. Waldie was the Director of the Conference. Their book was supposed to have been included in our folders when we all got to Washington. It was not included in the folders. The only place that it could be found, by sheer accident, was in the library of each hotel.

It has some of the most excellent material. All participants should have had this about May or June.

I received, in response to my request for 200 copies that we could then send out to all the leadership people in the communities, in the network, I received two copies. And I have been told there are no more available. I think this is something that we should really follow up and look into. I didn't mean to start this session on a negative note. But I did fail to do that in the last session. And I think it should be in the record.

In spite of the often negative press some excellent things have come out of the White House Conference. I think one of them is that we have tied groups, States, people, together for the first time. We have a network that is cohesive. I think that the Western States, speaking as one voice, we are continuing to meet with people from other States. At the Western Gerontological Society we are planning at the end of February, early in March, at the San Diego meeting, we will plan to have something on the agenda at that time, so we can again address the areas we are all so concerned about.

The results of this Conference were accomplished without any doubt under very trying circumstances. California had the largest and most vocal group of delegates and observers, over 320 in all. This final number was increased from the original 218 who were the representatives who had planned to recognize their objection to the voting routine. We had also done a great deal, had a great deal of training in parliamentary procedure because we stressed these as being very important for California to make a strong and impressive impact upon the individual committees of which they were members.

In spite of the negative publicity and the distorted rumors about California's delegation the first action we took at our first caucus was to announce we would not walk out of the Conference. There was information to the opposite. And somehow it leaked to the press. And we were accused of planning to walk out. I said no way would we travel 3,000 miles to walk away from an opportunity to voice the recommendations and concerns of California's 3.5 million persons over 60 years of age.

Certainly there were problems at the Conference, and they fell into three categories. First the format of the Conference itself—with an almost total change of the staff, and this caused numerous problems as you have heard. I don't want to repeat what we have heard from different ones, but we have been aware that the delegates were also unable to carry out their original plans for sharing rooms because of the changes in committees. You were asked to put down your choice one, two, and three of the committee preferences, and many of you did not get any of your choices. I was able to get my third, which was research, and I was one of the blue tags which, as you heard previously, you know what category I was in.

The third was the lack of the desirable accommodations. And previously as you have already heard Congressman Roybal refer to the fact that when hotels have large numbers of people eating and sleeping and spending their money in those hotels, those hotels give so much space for so many rooms occupied. This is a normal procedure. We do it all the time within our department when we have a training session. We go to the hotel that gives us the greater amount of space for the sleeping accommodations we are renting.

The final blow, as far as my personal feeling was, that after we had planned to sit as you do at State conferences, you sit with members of your State delegation, when I walked into that room on that last day, and I saw we were seated by committees, I really almost fainted. I could not believe this divisive thing had really been done. However, many of our delegates who had arrived earlier than I had, not only California, but New York, Pennsylvania, Arizona, some of the other States that we had been meeting with and getting together throughout the Conference with, they had sat together. When we were approached by the sergeant at arms or whoever the people who were the authorities at the Conference, to tell us that we were sitting in the wrong places, we just said there were no more seats in our committee space and that is where we were going to stay. So we did stay there.

As most of you know while we were very gentlemanly and ladylike about it, we did voice our resistance to the voting procedure, we were heard, and I think we did it in a very dignified fashion.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Janet Levy follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JANET J. LEVY, DIRECTOR, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF AGING

I cannot emphasize the appropriate timeliness of the 1981 Conference too strongly as many of the final resolutions are in direct conflict with current proposed budget cuts. The President has stated that persons should continue working until age 68, and yet the only remnant of an employment program is title V of the Older Americans Act, senior community service employment program, which has been threatened with total extinction. Hopefully, this will not occur as we already are hearing of strong Senate support for the continuation and possible expansion of this employment program. Unless the earning ceilings are raised or totally eliminated under the Social Security Act, there will be little incentive for persons receiving social security to supplement their inadequate incomes through employment.

The proposed reduction in expenditures for supportive services under title III-B of the Older Americans Act could well cause a shortage in transportation, information and referral, and other services which are the links between the needs of seniors and the availability of services. Without those services and programs, many older persons may be forced to relinquish their independent living arrangements for more costly and less satisfying institutional care. Serious consideration should be given to the resolution recommending that individuals or families be given a tax incentive when they are caring for elderly relatives within their own home. One of the critical needs of low-income seniors is affordable housing, although the administration has recommended cuts in both rental assistance and direct loan funding for the construction of new facilities. California is currently considering the enactment of State housing legislation, but without the overall national support, few States will be able to afford what is one of the highest priorities in the long list of needed services and benefits for older Americans.

Mr. ROYBAL. Miss Lacayo.

STATEMENT OF CARMELA LACAYO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ASOCIACION NACIONAL PRO PERSONAS MAYORES

Miss LACAYO. Thank you. I think it is very significant that the House Select Committee on Aging has played a key role in bringing to the fore all of the, should we say, concerns and interests with respect to this White House Conference on Aging.

I am Carmela Lacayo. I am executive director of the Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores. For the past 2 years my organization along with 22 other national organizations has been very intimately involved with the White House Conference, from the initial planning to the Conference itself. I was a member of the Technical Advisory Committee under Congressman Waldie and was a delegate to the Conference and along with Janet Levy and I think most of the California delegation with a blue tag ended up on the Research Committee.

The White House Conference experience I think I can describe best by saying it was sort of like being stoned to death with marshmallows. You sort of felt like you were drowning, but you didn't know why you were drowning. But somehow or other you were drowning.

The preconference planning, begun under Jerry Waldie, from a minority perspective, and I must emphasize this, I think was excellent. The fact that our organization and three other national minority organizations were asked to convene miniconferences on our respective constituencies, in our case the Hispanic elderly, brought into the process for the White House planning for the first time historically a true posture representing the concerns of low income and minority older Americans. And so the process was begun I think in a very well structured and a very well-organized fashion. I am not being partisan when I say this. I am saying for the first time in my experience we were asked as an organization to fully participate in a process where traditionally as minorities we have practically had to tear the doors down. So Congressman Waldie opened the doors for the process.

From March 1981 until the actual Conference we discovered as many of you discovered that there were closed doors. We were not able to get information. And I can go through the whole series of repetitious encounters, problems, concerns, lack of information, inability to get communication from those leading the Conference, that we all experienced.

Our organization is also a member of the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations which is a coalition of 22 national aging organizations in the United States. We sit on the Executive Committee of that Leadership Council. The Leadership Council in coalition with all of these national aging organizations have tried since September of this year to get information on delegates, on hotels, on organizations, on agenda, on the total parameters of the Conference, to no avail. It wasn't until inadvertently some of us began to get phone calls from the Republican National Committee that the whole thing blew up.

It is indeed an indictment I think upon the status of older Americans in this country that we have allowed ourselves to be so politicized that it has become a Republican versus a Democratic issue, and the concerns of older Americans in this country are not partisan issues. Their concerns are people issues, issues based on the very premise that every citizen in this country has a right to a dignified old age. And I think that the intent of the majority of those delegates who were selected through a very democratic process was to really bring about their concerns.

It was not to attack Ronald Reagan and his administration. It was not to tell the President of the United States that his budget cutting and his posture with respect to social service programs and his posture with respect to the concern of low income and poor older persons was not exactly as we would want it to be. That was not the intent. Yet we all experienced the coerciveness, the stringent restrictions, plus, and I think this is very important to note, Congressman, the fact that although the Conference was an extremely expensive event, that the quality of the Conference, everything from food to the way people were treated, was very, very unprofessional, it is again an indictment that the Government of the United States, who sponsored this Conference, could run such a shabby conference. It was indeed very sad.

Going back to the hotel space, the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, our organization, was confronted with the very same thing that Mrs. Levy stated. We were asked in one instance to pay $700 a day for caucus space for the minority delegates to meet. We were lucky enough to get a local church to give us the space for free. If we had not been able to use our resources, we would have been again forced to pay those large amounts of money for caucus space.

The same thing happened with respect to asking for special events. We had asked to hold a reception honoring certain persons at the White House Conference on Aging. And again we were forced into having to pay an exorbitant amount of money. We were told there was no catering service available. We were given a whole series of barriers for us to be able to participate as ordinary citizens. It is very sad this process came about.

The problem now, Congressman, is where do we go. I can reiterate and cover the many obstacles, many problems, lack of communications, frustrations. And the Leadership Council On Aging Organizations has gone on record both to Secretary Schweiker, to the President and to Congress, asking for a very, very intense investigation of the entire White House Conference. As a member of that leadership council I reiterate their posture. Sadly enough our last letters to Secretary Schweiker asking for a response to how this balloting process was to take place have not been responded to. We are kept in a total kind of cloud.

The balloting process is now my concern, because I really feel that the Conference in spite of what everybody has said was a very effective disorganized organization. I believe in spite of the fact that most of these individuals who react to the fact, I even mentioned Sol Alinsky, who was a very liberal sociologist and social worker in this century, I believe they used Sol Alinsky's tactics when they really had a conference based on disorganized organization. I think the fact none of us were given any information prior to arriving, the fact that when we arrived there we were waiting for an agenda, the fact that the committees were totally disorganized, no agendas for the committees, all of these factors to me were very well planned.

However, many of us had missed the boat. Many of us had been so concerned with the actual Conference, with the lack of logistics, with the disorganization, the problems we encountered in planning, that we have failed to really capture I think that the whole focal point, and that is regardless of the 600 recommendations made at that Conference, regardless of the tremendous participation of all the delegates, regardless of the coalitions created at that Conference that balloting process and that recap of the ballots are not in our hands.

The folks that are going to recap the ballots, that arrive in HHS, whenever they do arrive, the folks that are going to say I voted the way I voted and you voted the way you voted, are individuals who, up to now have shown us, are not concerned with truly representative positions. So that my concern is that the balloting process must be watched, it must be investigated, it must be controlled from forces outside of the Department of Health and Human Services for the very fact that up to now that Department has totally prostituted a democratic process, initiated by Congress, created by legislative mandate, and although it is under the title White House Conference it still has legislative mandate.

And I think the fact that that balloting process is a mail process, the fact they allowed observers to vote, the fact that none of us know how the balloting is going to be weighed, what percentages are going to be taken into account to make a recommendation, to accept a recommendation, the fact that we don't know whether an observer ballots are going to be counted in the same way as that delegate ballots.

So my premise is that unless that balloting process is controlled and watched, the document that comes out of this White House Conference which will be a document that allows us from a policy perspective to plan for the next 10 years the future of older Americans in this country could be a very manipulated document.

I truly believe that the older persons in this country will speak regardless of that document. But as we know historically that document has been used to promulgate and to promote and to create very important legislative history, which has impacted up to now the lives of older Americans.

I am going to make two very brief recommendations to you. One recommendation is that Congress recommended that an outside, independent review, such as the American Arbitration Society, and I must make a parentheses here—several of my colleagues said the State units on aging would be the appropriate focal point for recapping and recounting the ballots. I would agree in many instances the State units on aging would be the important focal point. But we must remember this Conference has become a very partisan conference and many of you saw the letter that went from the State of Texas, from the Governor's office, to the Republican National Committee, which stated that the Commission on Aging in the State of Texas had reviewed all of the delegates from the State of Texas and had marked with an asterisk for the Republican National Committee those delegates who would "sell out" the elderly to support the President. And that is a matter of public record.

I think that if we are putting these ballots into the hands of some States who have other interests that we will not again get an accurate response.

So I would recommend that the American Arbitration Society with the GAO as the Government watchdog be allowed to recap these ballots and to bring in a panel of expert gerontologists and consumers in the field of aging to put forth the final document from the White House Conference on Aging.

Second, I would recommend that Congress, specifically the House Select Committee on Aging, should convene a series of public hearings throughout the Nation, thus guaranteeing that the concerns and issues raised at the White House Conference on Aging by the majority of delegates are in fact the voice of older Americans, so that Congress itself, as the official watchdog, can in fact assure itself that many of those recommendations which were alleged to be too liberal and too expensive are in fact what the voting public, older public of this country, would really like to see enacted. And I think that is the only way we can assure ourselves that in the next 10 years this famous document can be a launching pad, can be a working document for policymakers, for legislators, for those of us in the field of aging, for older persons themselves to be assured that this country does give a damn about older people, that this country is willing to look at the reality and the needs of older people, and that even if Congress has to make decisions like cutting back half a B-1 bomber to make sure that the Older Americans Act program is enacted for the next 5 years at full inflationary cost, then let it be. That Congress as our only hope for the next 3 years can in fact decide that while we need a very strong defense, we also need a very strong citizenry, and that we can sacrifice part of our defense budget to keep Oder American Act programs, the Social Security Act and those things which give us our lifestream for older Americans.

So, Congressman, I thank you. I hope that the marshmallow experience does not ever happen again. I hope that if it does happen, that at least we get some nuts and chocolate and a cherry on top.

Thank you so much.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you.

The next witness is Mr. Andy Gutierrez.

STATEMENT OF ANDY GUTIERREZ, LOS ANGELES CITY AND COUNTY COORDINATOR FOR 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Thank you, Congressman.

I am going to forgo part of my prepared remarks, because most of what I was going to say has already been said and I think it would just be repeating the litany of concerns about the White House Conference on Aging.

I am the coordinator for the Los Angeles County delegation to the White House Conference on Aging. Prior to the White House Conference we held four meetings for the purpose of providing information and orientation to the delegates and observers.

As you know, a lot of older persons do not have the sophistication to understand the complexities of the logistics of a conference, the travel, the lodging, and the meals. It created a lot of anxiety and stress among a lot of older persons when they were not receiving information about travel, lodging, and meals.

Even more serious was the lack of familiarization with the reports that came out of the miniconferences and the technical committees. All that has been rehearsed before you, Congressman.

I want to share with you my own personal experience in the committee that I was appointed to, the Committee on Family and Community Support Systems.

I want to say that it was a fair committee. I feel that the chairperson was very fair. I cannot understand how 5 or 6 people whom we identified as proadministration people could stack a committee of 250 persons. The discussion was open. The discussion was free. There were arguments. The debate I felt was fair and equitable in this committee.

Those of us who were representing ethnic minorities at this particular committee were able to caucus and come up with a report that I feel is very equitable to our concerns.

The chairman gave everyone an opportunity to express any feelings regarding this particular topic. For this reason I want to indicate to you that the report that came out of this committee is a fair report.

I want to commend Dr. Fernando Torres-Gil's recommendations to you. We have this document of 600 recommendations. And I think it is important now that proper followup be made with these recommendations.

As coordinator for the Los Angeles County delegation, I am calling a meeting of the delegates and observers from Los Angeles County on January 11, at Saint Sophia's Cathedral here. I have indicated in my communication to the delegation that the purpose of this committee is twofold. And I want you to hear this.

The first concern is, we want to know and hear your responses, positive or negative, regarding the recommendations that came out of your particular committee or any of the committees with which you are knowledgeable at the White House Conference on Aging.

Secondly, we want to discuss at this meeting all of these responses. We want to share our knowledge. We want to enlighten each other and hopefully arrive at a consensus that will reflect that which is in the best interests of senior citizens in this country.

I feel that there is a lot that is positive that came out of the White House Conference on Aging. I have read most of the reports. There are a lot of nuggets, a lot of positive recommendations. And I would hope that much of the negativism that has been expressed here today would not lose sight of the good things that came out of many of those reports.

I have talked to many delegates and observers from Los Angeles County at the White House Conference and a lot of them are saying to me, "My experience in my particular committee was very positive. Never was I inhibited, never was I deprived in being able to say what I wanted to say."

Now, having said that, I want to make one recommendation to you, Congressman.

If it is at all possible and within your power to request the administration to extend the date of the submission of the commentary on the recommendations at least 1 month, say the latter part of February, say February 24, in order to give delegates and observers more time to discuss the recommendations among themselves. I am hoping that you can bring this about.

Thank you.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you, Mr. Gutierrez.

The next witness, coming from San Diego, is Dr. Robert Ruby.

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT RUBY, SAN DIEGO DELEGATE, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Dr. RUBY. Mr. Chairman, the 1981 White House Conference on Aging was my second White House Conference on Aging.

I am already afraid of what might be done to us in 1981. So I appreciate you having this hearing. And I am very glad to see so many of my colleagues and friends here, to make sure we are prepared for the next 10 years. It is sort of like urban warfare against those in Washington.

There have been a lot of issues covered here. I would like to comment on some of the areas.

One is the process prior to the White House Conference, how people were selected. I think it was extremely misleading. There was not money given to people. We started working in the spring of 1980 at our own expense, trying to hold forums. It was our expense for our gas, our time. The Federal or State government did not have money for us. Yet they told us this is what we had to do.

They also imposed a grid upon us. The grid was I think applicable from Washington, D.C., but not applicable as to the specific areas it applied to, such as San Diego County. Let me give you one instance.

We had to select a poor person. So we go around and say "If you are a poor elderly person, please stick up your hand and volunteer." I think that is asking a little too much for people to divulge what their economic resources are, sort of a means test to be eligible to go to the Conference, because you had to go to the State House Conference to get to the White House Conference.

Even if you did volunteer this information that you are a poor elderly person, at the time there was no money, or we were not aware there would be money available to pay people's way and expenses to the State House Conference on Aging. So if you are a poor elderly person at that time and you do happen to get selected, you may have to pay your own way. But how will you pay your own way?

So there is a lot of conflicting information given to us. But we had to implement this plan given to us by the State, and from what I am hearing this morning it was given to the State by the administration. That was, I believe, the Carter administration at that time.

A couple of other aspects: One is in reference to the minireports, or these conferences they had. This is the report of the miniconference on the "National Dialog for the Business Sector." I was assigned to committee 12, the private sector involvement.

When I got to the White House Conference and we met, I looked at the agenda which I have here, and it was older Americans as clients in the community service agencies and voluntary associations' responsibilities and contributions of private enterprise, older Americans as volunteers, older Americans as consumers of goods and services.

We paid for a special miniconference on the business sector. This information came to me 1 week prior to going to the White House

Conference. It was very hard to read this in reference to what was going to happen because I didn't have this agenda. When I got to the Conference they gave me this agenda. I said, why did we spend money for the miniconference if we were not going to utilize this information? The chairman of the Committee on the Private Sector I believe is the president of one of the large pharmaceutical corporations. Our vice chairman was the vice president of Pacific Gas & Electric.

We had a very difficult time changing this agenda. Finally we got it changed so the last day we talked about private pensions. Of course the private pension, they don't want to talk about that.

I was very disturbed why we would spend money for a report like this. What disturbed me more was, I tried to go to this Conference. I called them. I said may I please attend that Conference at my expense strictly as an observer? I was told the Conference was only by invitation and I wasn't invited.

So that is how we are spending our public money for public conferences.

Another thing some of my friends have asked me—how was my $6 million vacation. I would like to see some type of budget report as to how that $6 million was spent prior to the Conference. What happened to the people whose ways were paid to the miniconferences for doing the reports, the staff? How much was spent prior to the actual Conference and how much was spent at the Conference? Because to me it was not a $6 million Conference, except for the delegates that had to pay their own way—I mean the observers.

Another little thing, the PDPP formula. As we talk about the outcome of the White House Conference, we have not really had an outcome yet. We have a sheet of paper with recommendations on it and some votes. We don't have anything out of that Conference yet. Now is the toughest part. Now is the time we really have to begin to fight.

I think we can thank President Reagan for stepping on our fingers because now we know how hard we do have to fight. I think the PDPP formula—that means programs equal dollars, dollars equal power, and power equals politics. If we reverse that, what I have seen coming out of the 1981 Conference is that seniors can be political and are a political force, if they organize themselves politically we have power, if we have power we get dollars, if we get dollars we have programs to provide food and transportation for the people who are in need.

I would like to make some recommendations for the follow-up of the White House Conference.

In 1971 there was a congressional report on the post-1971 White House Conference on Aging hearing in which they listed all the recommendations that have been approved and then they called in the administration and said, "Which ones have you implemented, and why not?" And I would like to see that happen in 2 or 3 years down the road, to see what happened in the 1981 Conference on Aging.

Also, I would like to see maybe by 1988 that we have legislation passed for the 1991 Conference on Aging and that we have a preliminary agenda set out for this country so we know what we are going to be focusing on and talking about.

And third, what I would like to do is, anybody planning on going to the 1991 Conference on Aging become extremely knowledgable on the issues, but also realize that it is politics and anybody we send back there, anybody that goes back there, it is politics, and without political knowledge, without an awareness of the political aspects of this, we will not get the programs that this country deserves, those people in this country that deserve them, over age 65.

That sort of summarizes my comments. Thank you.

Mr. **Roybal**. Thank you, Dr. Ruby.

I note there seems to be a slight difference of opinion with regard to the Conference. It has been described as a family reunion run by strangers. I have also been told that it was a Conference that made the delegates feel they were stoned to death with marshmallows. The statement I liked particularly was that we must translate our anger into action. These words imply there was some dissatisfaction with the way the Conference was conducted.

I also heard that something positive came out of the Conference. Those who were critical of the way the Conference was run also complimented the final outcome. In spite of all the negative things that took place, something positive did in fact come out of the Conference.

The difference of opinion I think has been expressed by Mr. Gutierrez, who said that the report was fair. I suppose that any final report should have an element of fairness, if in fact people are given the opportunity to caucus and discuss.

I have a question for Mr. Gutierrez. You implied that you had ample opportunity to caucus, a caucus room or rooms were supplied for you, and no attempt was made on the part of anyone to prevent the caucusing of the delegates. Is that a correct assumption on my part?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. That is.

I am going to divulge something that I am sure the chairperson of our committee would never want to divulge to the Reagan administration: That the chairperson in our committee did divide the committee into—she didn't want to say subcommittees—smaller groups. And these smaller groups dealt with particular conferences of the topic under consideration.

Mr. **Roybal**. Where did you meet, Mr. Gutierrez? You said you had the ample space to meet and to discuss.

Mr. **Gutierrez**. Our committee room was almost as large as this.

Mr. **Roybal**. You had a committee room for your own committee?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. Yes; that is right.

Mr. **Roybal**. Was that also a sleeping accommodation?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. Oh, no. It was a hotel conference room.

Mr. **Roybal**. Was this conference room made available by the hotel did someone have to pay for it as an additional expense?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. It was one of the assigned conference rooms for the Conference; for the committee, rather.

Mr. **Roybal**. Your committee did have a conference room. The delegates that attended the Conference representing your committee all had a conference room in which they would meet with no cost to them or anyone else. Now, who paid for that room?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. Well, the White House Conference.

Mr. **Roybal**. Why was it available to you and not to others? Did each committee have a caucus room assigned to them?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. That is correct, yes.

Mr. **Roybal**. I would like to know if each committee had an assigned caucus room similar to yours?

Ms. **Lacayo**. Each committee was assigned a hotel room in which they met for the committee meetings. Very few of the actual committees allowed people to come back in after the committee meetings for caucuses. That was the problem. During the actual agenda of the specific committee you had a room. Interestingly enough, however, there were different rooms, different sizes for different groups. Some of us were packed into rooms like sausages. Others had ample room. It is a tremendous discrepancy here on that whole process.

The problem of caucus rooms, there were no caucus rooms available for any group after the actual committee meetings. If you wanted a caucus room you had to pay for it.

Mr. **Roybal**. Mr. Gutierrez, do you agree with that statement?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. Yes. But I want you to understand that the chairperson of our committee divided the whole committee into smaller groups. If you want to define these as caucuses, let it be; well, subcommittees. And interestingly, even members of my subcommittee were able to caucus outside of the committee.

Mr. **Roybal**. Who was running your committee? Who was in charge of it? And who was the one person that finally made the determination to form subcommittees which would individually meet to discuss the problems at hand?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. Is there someone here in the room in the family and community support system?

Ms. **Helton**. It was a motion we passed to break into small discussion groups.

Mr. **Roybal**. Here is a committee that did in fact, by motion, reduce the full committee to subcommittees, which provided the opportunity for smaller discussion groups.

Mr. **Gutierrez**. That is correct.

Mr. **Roybal**. How does that differ, Ms. Lacayo, from other committees, and why didn't the other committees avail themselves of the same opportunity?

Ms. **Lacayo**. Congressman, each committee was run pretty much at the will and whim of whoever happened to be chairing that committee.

As you will note, Dr. Ruby came in with an agenda he was given at his committee. Other committees, and Janet Levy and I were in the research, we walked into the Research Committee and had absolutely no agenda, nothing. In fact, we spent the first day arguing about how to run the committee. So each committee it seems was kind of programed to be run by that particular chairperson.

Interestingly enough, and perhaps you could check this out—my understanding is that the recorders and the facilitators for the committees were fired the Saturday prior to the Conference, and a whole new group of recorders, facilitators and parliamentarians were brought in. In fact, I tried time and again during the Conference to get the parliamentary rules that would govern the operation of the committees and to no avail. We were not even able to get any parliamentary procedures. And I think most folks in the room who were delegates can say that, depending on who ran that particular committee, each committee was run depending on the whim of that chairperson and the strength of the delegates in that particular committee.

Mr. **Roybal**. Am I correct in assuming that there were some chairpersons that did properly run the business of the committee?

Ms. **Lacayo**. Yes, sir. I think that the fact that the Committee on Economic Well-Being came out with an exceptional document, it may not be exactly the way we would have wanted it—and the Committee on Women, for example, came out with some excellent recommendations.

Mr. **Roybal**. Am I also correct in assuming that the recommendations made by these committees are excellent recommendations which can be attributed traced to the fact that people were given the opportunity to caucus, to meet and discuss?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. Yes.

Ms. **Lacayo**. No. People caucused because they created the wherewithal to caucus, not because they were given the opportunity. In fact, if one looks at the agenda of the conference, you would see from 8 o'clock in the morning until 9, 10 o'clock at night you had a tight schedule that kept you going. If you wanted to eat a meal, you had to be at an eating place at a certain time. There was no way you could go caucus.

Mr. **Roybal**. Someone testified this morning that according to the rules no subcommittees could be formed. The fact that your committee, Mr. Gutierrez, did in fact form subcommittees, was that a violation of the rules?

Mr. **Gutierrez**. Technically it was in violation.

Mr. **Roybal**. What you did and what the committee finally came up with was done simply because the committee exerted itself and wanted to do it, not because of the rules. Since the rules stated no subcommittee could be formed, and you in fact did form a subcommittee, that did not necessarily meet with the true spirit of the rule itself.

Mr. **Gutierrez**. We may have had an unusual committee.

Mr. **Roybal**. That is what I am trying to get at. I would like to be able to put that into the record. Your committee might have been an unusual one. I would like to compliment the committee and its members because it was unusual. Perhaps this is something that we would like to recommend be done in future conferences.

Mr. **Gutierrez**. It was Dr. Adelaide Alard, the chairperson of that committee.

Mr. **Roybal**. Dr. Alard in my opinon should be commended for exerting the wishes of the committee, particularly in deciding to have subcommittees. I am glad that that took place.

Mr. **Gutierrez**. Miss Levy indicates to me she was the chairperson of the Federal Council.

Mrs. **Levy**. She has been appointed Chairperson of the new Federal Council, which is reassuring, because this is a Presidential appointment.

Mr. **Roybal**. I am glad to hear that.

I have some other questions. I am still in doubt about some of the things that have been said.

Dr. Ruby, I think you said something to the effect that the chairman or vice chairman of one of the committees was the vice chairman of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Dr. RUBY. That is correct. He is I believe the vice president of Pacific Gas & Electric. He really had very little to do since the chairman chaired the entire meeting, and he only sat there smiling.

Mr. ROYBAL. One of the main reasons that many Members of Congress did not really attend every one of the sessions was concern that the Congress be accused of trying to run the Conference. I don't know just how many delegates came from the private sector who were chairmen of gas and electric companies, maybe of defense corporations, and things of that kind. Has anyone looked into the background of the delegates to find out the kind of representation at the conference?

Dr. RUBY. As far as I know, no one has. But I would not be in a position to do that. If I was, I don't know if the information would be made available.

Mrs. LEVY. That was one of the reasons we were anxious to get the names and the identities of the new people that were added to our delegate list, Congressman. We wanted to know just what their backgrounds were. There were enough very well-qualified people, such as in California we had some people who had been in the field for a long time, that made the majority of people who were not qualified look a little better by naming those people.

Mrs. Russell, chairman of the California Commission on Aging for some number of years, was selected as one of the recently appointed delegates-at-large, which made very good sense because she has a long history of being involved and has been recently appointed to the Federal Council also. But the majority of them—we had one gentleman up north who was appointed as a delegate-at-large who called us to find out if we knew who appointed him, why he was appointed, what was this conference all about, et cetera, had no knowledge at all. Yet he had been appointed as a delegate. He refused to come. He turned in his slot because he said, "I don't see that I could contribute anything." But this was a very, very unique situation.

Mr. ROYBAL. I have a few more questions. We would like to get to the other panel as soon as possible. But I am somewhat concerned that the quality of the Conference was very low. I think Ms. Lacayo said even the food left a lot to be desired.

Did the budget cuts affect this? Why was the quality of the Conference so low?

Ms. LACAYO. Congressman, I really cannot answer that. I think you would have to ask the folks who ran the Conference. But I know, going back to statements that have been made, and your own experience in going to a major hotel of that kind and blocking off the amount of rooms blocked off, in two major hotels in Washington, the fact that catering arrangements were made by Mashman Associates for the meals, and the fact that the first morning, most of us who partook of the great breaking of the bread, it was a little Danish roll and a cup of coffee that people had for breakfast.

I would suggest, Congressman, going back to a recommendation Dr. Ruby made, that an accounting be asked by Congress, by GAO perhaps, especially of Mashman Associates, with respect to how those catering arrangements were made, the types of arrangements made for the meals; the meal on Sunday night was a sad example of a meal. Most people were frustrated.

Older persons had to stand in line, wait for a long time to get a little tiny plate of almost nothing. If you were not there early you didn't get the best. Paper plates. It was very, very interesting to me.

I would be interested in knowing how Mashman Associates could cut a deal with the Sheraton Washington Hotel, the Hilton Hotel, and not get complimentary rooms to be used after; second, inform the hotels if anybody was going to get any type of catering service or rooms after the hours of the Conference that they should charge the maximum amounts, and the fact that the meals, the service, everything was so poor.

I would suggest that, in your asking for an accounting of moneys, Mashman Associates be looked at very, very, very closely.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you.

One other thing concerns me. The counting of the ballots will not be in the hands of the delegates but it will be done by a group assigned by someone. Therefore, you made the recommendation that an impartial group be requested to conduct the counting of the ballots.

I have signed a letter with other members of the Aging Committee requesting that the GAO be involved in counting the ballots. That does not necessarily preclude any organization such as the American Arbitration Society to take part in the counting of the ballots.

Would you agree that it would be proper, not only to request an outside organization conduct a count of the ballot, but that we in fact as a committee recommend that both the American Arbitration Society and the GAO be involved? Would that be in agreement?

I would assume that that is the consensus of those present here today, and that recommendation will be made to the full committee.

One last question. This is with regard to the accounting that is being requested. Would it be your recommendation that the GAO do the auditing, or that it be done by a private firm outside of Government?

Ms. LACAYO. I would think that Congress, the GAO should be the watchdog for Congress, and that it would be the appropriate arm.

I might add also, in line with that, and I don't know what the legalities are of this, but it would seem to me that the question should be raised as to how many Republican National Committee staffers were put on the payroll for an interim time, on the White House Conference staff, and also if there was any exchange of subsidies, volunteers, et cetera, by the RNC with respect to the Conference, because I know from my own personal experience that was staffed with a tremendous amount of RNC people.

Mr. ROYBAL. This would include in my opinion a very positive review of the staffing of the Conference, which would include also those paid from other accounts, those who may be on loan from other departments of the Federal Government to the Conference itself. While their salary may not have come out of so-called Conference expense, it still remains that they got paid from somewhere, and that the moneys did come from the Federal Government as a whole.

So then you would agree that the GAO would be the agency to conduct such a survey?

Ms. **Lacayo**. Yes.

Mr. **Roybal**. Thank you very much.

The following panel is made up of Eva Kirby, Dr. Ruth Weg, Maggie Helton, Barbara Garcia-Weed, Helen Huber, and Toni Rini. Please proceed in the following order: First, Dr. Ruth Weg, followed by Eva Kirby.

STATEMENT OF DR. RUTH WEG, OBSERVER, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Dr. **Weg**. Thank you, Congressman Roybal.

I am a physiologist and a gerontologist from the Andrus Center.

It was a privilege to be at the Conference with all of its negatives and positives. This was the second White House Conference I attended.

I want to thank you, Congressman, for this opportunity to speak because, as one of the observers appointed by the Governor, I can say that most of us spent the time at the Conference in the back of the bus, and it was an education. We learned a lot of restraint, patience, and we spoke generally through the good offices of delegates who knew us, although originally we had been advised that the primary and only difference between the observers and the delegates would be the lack of a vote.

In terms of what others have said, I would like to add that when you arrived at the Conference, and especially that first evening, the quality of the Conference reminded me of when I first read "Alice in Wonderland"—the Mad Hatter, the March Hare. Fernandos said the family coming together for a picnic, but unfortunately it was run by strangers that we did not know.

We very soon learned the nature of our strangers. They generally walked around in our various committees with walkie-talkies, and made very rapid communication with like members in other committees.

I would like to concentrate on the quality of the committee. I am glad it was raised in the panel before.

If we begin, first of all, with that opening shot, so-called buffet dinner, being a physiologist, emphasizing a lot of my work in health and nutrition, it was an insult; it showed ignorance; it showed lack of regard, because not only did you wait an hour and a half; when you got to the table, it was bare. When it was not bare, there were oysters, raw oysters, very sandy, very poorly served, and generally inappropriate as fare for many persons in their seventies and eighties.

The breakfast—Schweiker alluded to the good nutrition. And it was really only to laugh, because, in general, the nutrition was very poor, poorly balanced. And breakfast of juice and coffee or tea, and a hard roll or a sweet roll is hardly reference to an understanding of what is appropriate.

The opening plenary session again had the quality of ignoring the needs and the dignity of those gathered.

Constance Armitage, our newly appointed Chairman of the White House Conference, began the introduction of Schweiker. As people rose to demand the floor, particularly to discuss the change in the rules, so that we could vote for each of the committee's reports, like the rest of the quality of this Conference, she ignored the requests of those gathered. She went right on to introduce Schweiker.

Schweiker spoke very positively about the promotion of David Rust. And, of course, we know that not only was there laughter in the audience, but there were boos in the audience. He emphasized, as did many of the people newly appointed, the voluntarism and the independence of our older population, and translated, Congressman, that meant without any support from the Federal Government. And in each of our committees that was the effort that was made.

And the quality at the final session, and then I want to get to my own committee briefly—as I walked into the international ballroom, again, as an observer, I was assigned to the back, way in the back. It was packed. When I received permission to take some photographs up front, I had the young man who gave me that permission say, "Please be sure you come back quickly; you are not allowed up there." When I walked very close to the stage, I saw literally 50 to 60 seats that were empty in the front, and so many of us could have sat there.

I want you to know something very interesting. When I returned, as I promised I would, to sit in my seat at the back, the young man said to me, "Well, when is the demonstration going to take place?" He was about 22 to 23, if one can judge from appearance, and inexperienced. He said: "Tell me, because I am so tired, I don't know if I can handle it." So, for whatever reason, they were primed for some kind of demonstration.

Frankly, I wish it could have come off. And I said that to many. I said, I hope it comes off; I am really not certain that it will. But that is what this meeting deserves.

My overall impression was that it was a frustrating experience, a draining experience. But it was, after all, a challenge, exciting, and absorbing.

The appointment of 400 delegates within 2 weeks of the Conference and the shifting of all the chairs, and the staff directors left many of the committees not functioning as adequately as Andy described. In our own committee, we had a staff person, a staff director, who insisted upon every recommendation that was made that we must have an economic cost identified; that we would have to provide in order to be permitted to pass this resolution, the cost identified. We know that that was impossible. It was not required. They made it appear to be required.

So, for 2 days we delayed and we labored to get costs. And then all of us heard the final report as we did, the final plenary session; we knew many committees had already dealt with that, and said that was an impossible prerequisite; that there were no rules that stated it was required. But we were led to believe that it was.

In addition to which, the staff director behaved as if she indeed were a delegate. When we would rise to have a resolution, or to have it voted on, she would insist this was a resolution that would cost so much money the administration would not accept it.

So she was making a delegate's position heard, or at least an observer, but she was to have been impartial, supportive help to the chairperson.

I did indeed rise to say she was out of order, and that I expected the chairperson to hold her in check. And it happened only a couple of times after that. But I think this was indicative of the directions that were provided for the staff of the various committees.

The overriding feeling was one of being manipulated, as has been said, of being herded, of being muffled. And I think one of the primary qualities that was disturbing to me, and that makes me fear for the future of whatever legislation we can bring out of the recommendations, was the effort that had to be expended by those of us, the delegates and the observers, to hold on to the last 20 years of progress that we have made so that less creative energy was available to put forward legislation and ideas for legislation that indeed would look 10 to 15 years down the pike.

To me, that was the most negative quality.

I was disturbed by the abrogation of Roberts' Rules, which took place in many of the committees, and that everyone had to accept it. We did try desperately in our committee, which, in general, came out with some excellent recommendations, with a battle—the concerns of older women, growing numbers, special needs. But we had to do it in spite of the staff and the so-called supportive help; the fact that the chairperson had the final word as to what was germane and appropriate; the fact that we could not change any of the rules, and we tried to do that the first hour or two; the fact that we could not appeal the decision of the Chair.

I have never attended meetings of that kind. To me, the quality of the White House Conferences in the past has been not only the legislation that would have come out, but the inspiration for those gathered and for the Congress, indeed. There was one inspirational figure at that Conference, and that was Claude Pepper. I found that everyone else who spoke from the administration, including our President, provided very little hope and very little inspiration. What was most hopeful, of course, and most positive, were those that gathered, older persons from across the country, having the opportunity to come together, even if their voice could not be heard as clearly as it should have, there was a dynamic that will continue, and that was positive.

I was most impressed that they came prepared, well informed, able to make a point clearly, with good knowledge of how laws can be made.

So I have great respect for the older persons in this country. And that is where I place my hope. And I hope that you, Congressman Roybal, will also place your confidence in them and those of us who have been supportive, working in the field, hanging on to the progress we have made, and hoping that we can continue now to put our energies to the creative steps we must take if we look to the future.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you, Dr. Weg.

Now, we will hear from Eva Kirby.

May I also request that you try to hold your statement down to 5 minutes. We have five of you yet to hear from. We hope you will not be repeating any of the previous testimony. We would like to get some new information if it is possible.

STATEMENT OF EVA KIRBY, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING DELEGATE APPOINTED BY REPRESENTATIVE BOBBI FIEDLER, MEMBER, ECONOMIC WELL-BEING COMMITTEE

Dr. KIRBY. Thank you, Congressman. I am Eva Kirby, a delegate to the 1981 White House Conference on Aging, appointed in April 1981 by Congresswoman Bobbi Fiedler, of the 21st Congressional District. I would like to say at no time was I telephoned by any group to find out what my political stance was.

I also want to say that I hope to bring another point of view to the hearing today. I will make a number of positive statements. There will be some negative—and some recommendations.

I personally found the Conference to be exciting, stimulating, challenging, productive, and somewhat frustrating.

First, may I say that I found the communications and logistics regarding transportation to and from Washington, the housing there, and the transportation at the Conference between the two hotels well planned and efficiently operated. Most of the luncheons and the dinners were well prepared and well served. The continental breakfasts were inadequate and poor nutritionally. And the two receptions were a disaster, from the point of view of both logistics and the provisions from the needs of seniors and certainly a waste of the money which had been allocated to them.

Registration at the Sheraton was well organized and efficient and the informational packets complete and informative and did contain the rules for the Convention.

I would like to make one comment you have not heard about the Sheraton. Many of us found they use some type of detergent on their sheets and pillows, and many of us broke out with a rash from head to foot. I am sure it was the detergent and not the conference.

Crowd control, I felt, was very well handled except for the two receptions which we previously mentioned, and they were disastrous.

I was pleased to be assigned to the committee of my first choice, Committee No. 2, on Economic Well-Being.

I think you should know that I did receive the full packet with all of the miniconference summaries, and with the technical committee summaries and full reports in October. So I had at least a month and a half in which to read them. My one problem: I was not sure which one to read, and there was too much to digest, and I did not get my committee assignment until late in November, and this was, I felt, a decided disadvantage.

In my committee, Committee No. 2, I found that the planning was excellent as to operation procedures in the committee sessions—with a sincere effort to provide a democratic process where as many as possible could be heard, and, where reasonable, if limited, debate could occur.

I would like to pay tribute to our chairman, Robert Steele, and our vice chairman, Robert Beinum, who demonstrated real leadership skills and political astuteness in conducting an orderly and fair committee process, in spite of unbelievable and uncalled-for disruption in one particular session.

I would invite Congressmen to carefully read the report from Committee No. 2, and I think you will find that report is positive, constructive and surprisingly close to the Technical Committee's recommendations.

Our first day in committee, we were provided an agenda, and that agenda surprisingly followed the August 1981 report from the White House Conference on Aging, which we were mailed in August. We were given half of the morning to decide whether we wished to modify that agenda and to establish time limits to each of those areas for discussion.

I did feel the committee was too large for good interaction and providing satisfactory opportunity for all to be heard. There were 150 delegates and 150 observers, and, it seemed to me, 300 members of the press.

I did feel the topic was too broad and all committees were asked to address too many of the same topics.

I would suggest that in future planning there be more committees and the scope of the topic be limited and fewer delegates assigned to each of the committees.

There was observable frustration and misunderstanding on the part of observers, at least in my committee, as to their role. Some demanded to participate as full delegates. They were confused as to what the role of an observer was. And I would suggest better instruction to observers prior to the Conference, fewer observers at the Conference, or if they have no function, perhaps no observers.

I felt it inappropriate for a national advisory committee member, who served on the Technical Committee, and then oriented the Committee No. 2, to also be a delegate on that same committee. He tended to usurp too much of the floor with his resolutions.

It was unfortunate that disruptive and pressure tactics were attempted to coerce and influence members of Committee No. 2 to accept the point of view of a congressional honorary chairman. Our committee chairman handled the situation in a most creative and professional manner, however, when we would have arrived at exactly the same compromise statement without this disruption.

I did resent the continual antiadministration and partisan undertones, remarks, and comments, and felt, as we delegates were not presented the reliable hard data in sufficient time and quantity to provide for considered study and deliberate investigation, so that we could arrive at objective and valid conclusions; the atmosphere was too partisan, regardless of which side we are talking about, too emotional and personal, and often charged with suspicion and negative attitudes.

It seemed that, like Congress, the committees found it impossible to accept and face the hard issues regarding the financial crisis in our social security system. Not enough attention was given to the long-range solvency which is needed. However, I think you will find that we have balanced recommendations that deal not only with medical concerns, but have recommendations affecting the general welfare and health of the economy-at-large.

I felt there was a lack of coordination at the Conference for the California delegates; there seemed to be little or no direction provided for committee caucus work, and there was, unfortunately, a critical and generally negative tone on the part of some of our Californians.

I regret this, because we could have exerted greater positive constructive leadership.

However, having read the final report, I am pleased with the overall positive and balanced recommendations. I have received the full final report and the questionnaire, and I appreciate the opportunity to respond personally and in writing, and I feel that the time provided will, for me at least, be adequate.

I think that those who called and organized and directed this conference are to be commended for overcoming the odds and producing a volume of challenging and positive recommendations to guide the administration and Congress in future decisionmaking in matters concerning our graying population.

I would like to recommend that we give special attention to forming new formats and coalitions for effectively advocating the needs of our elderly and assuring a fair, good, balanced crosscut of all of our aging population.

Aging is not a partisan issue, regardless of which party you are from. And I believe that we will see positive outcomes from this Conference. We need to move ahead on a nonpartisan basis to negate the feelings of "them against us," and seek ways in which we can constructively work together for all of us over 65.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Eva Kirby follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF EVA KIRBY, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING DELEGATE, APPOINTED BY REPRESENTATIVE BOBBI FIEDLER, MEMBER ECONOMIC WELL BEING COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I am Eva Kirby a delegate to the 1981 White House Conference on Aging, appointed in April 1981 by Congresswoman Bobbie Fiedler of the 21st Congressional District. I served on committee No. 2, Economic Well-Being, which considered social security and related matters.

I am glad to have this opportunity to testify regarding the conference operations as they occurred at Washington. I want to bring another point of view and some positive statements to this hearing.

I found the conference exciting, stimulating, challenging, productive and at times frustrating.

1. First may I say that I found the communications and logistics regarding transportation to and from Washington, the housing, and the transportation at the conference between conference hotels well planned and efficiently operated. Most of the luncheons and dinners were well prepared and well served. The continental breakfasts were inadequate and poor nutritionally, and the two receptions were a disaster from the point of view of logistics and provisions for the needs of seniors, and certainly a waste of the money allocated for them ($6 plus for breakfasts and $22 plus for receptions).

2. Registration (at the Sheraton) was well organized and efficient, and the informational packets complete, informative, and my packet contained the operating procedural rules of the Conference. I felt these rules were reasonable and designed to insure an orderly, fair, democratic process and to provide the most efficient way for full participation by the large number of delegates assigned to each committee.

3. Crowd control was handled very well, except for the two receptions previously mentioned.

4. I was pleased to be assigned to the committee of my first choice, committee No. 2, Economic Well-Being. I did receive late in October a mailing which included all of the reports of the technical committees and the mini conferences. In addition, during the month of November I received mailings of position statements, resolutions, and information from the following.

California State House Conference on Aging; Western States Caucus WHCOA; National Council on Aging, Inc.; American Occupational Therapy Association, Inc.; American Psychological Association; Rural America; National Commission on Legal Problems for Elderly; American Academy of Ophthamology; National Association of State Units on Aging; Leadership Council of Aging Organizations; Council Action Agency; National Interfaith Coalition on Aging; Gray Panthers; National Retired Teachers Association; and American Association of Retired Persons, and so forth.

Had the committee assignment been made earlier, than in later November, I would have felt better prepared on the specific topic, Economic Well-Being, and would have had time to collect the hard data and reliable facts needed. (I felt that most of the resources speeches provided at the Conference did not present reliable data and were biased in favor of increased spending for social programs.) I would have found it helpful to have met and studied with other California delegates assigned to Committee No. 2.

5. In my committee, committee No. 2, Economic Well-Being, I found the planning excellent as to operational procedures in the committee sessions, with a sincere effort made to provide a democratic process where as many delegates as possible could be heard and where reasonable, if limited, debate could occur. There was wide divergence of opinion expressed and we viewed divergence not as a threat but as healthy debate. I challenge the rumors that this committee was stacked. At our first meeting we were presented a typed agenda that closely compared to the committee agenda as outlined in the August "Report from the White House Conference on Aging" and we were given the opportunity to modify the agenda and establish a timeframe for accomplishing its scope.

I would like to pay tribute to our chairman, Robert Steele and Vice-Chairman Robert Bynum who demonstrated real leadership skill and political astuteness in conducting an orderly and fair committee process in spite of unbelievable and uncalled for outside demonstrations and disruption in one particular session. Our chairman and his team were given a standing ovation by our entire committee. In spite of the differences, we felt good about what had been accomplished.

6. The committees were too large for good interaction and to provide satisfying opportunity for all to be heard (150 delegates, 150 observers and numerous press and TV). Topics were too broad and all committees were asked to address several of the same topics. I would recommend that in future planning, there be more committees and the scope of the topics be limited, and fewer delegates in each committee.

7. There was obvious frustration and misunderstanding on the part of observers as to their role. Some demanded to participate as delegates. They did not seem to understand the role of observer. I would recommend better instruction to observers prior to the conference, fewer observers at the conference, or perhaps no observers.

8. I felt it was inappropriate for a national advisory committee member, who served on the Technical Committee, and who spoke to orient the committee to also be a delegate in the same committee. He tended to usurp too much of the floor with his resolutions and comments.

9. It was unfortunate that disruptive and pressure tactics were attempted to coerce and influence members of committee No. 2 to accept the point of view of a Congressional honorary chairman. Our committee chairman handled the situation in a most creative manner, however the committee would have arrived at the same compromise statements without this disruption. We had already had such resolutions presented and other waiting to be presented.

10. I resented the continual anti-administration undertone, and partisan remarks and comments, and felt we, as delegates, were not presented the reliable hard data in sufficient time and quantity to provide for considered study and deliberation so as to arrive at objective and valid conclusions. The atmosphere was too partisan (and I don't mean pro-administration) emotional and personal often charged with suspicion and negative attitudes.

11. It seemed that, like Congress, the committees found it impossible to accept and face the hard issues regarding the fiscal crises in our social security system. Many delegates were so concerned with the "no cut" and "more" syndrome of the "great society" that not enough attention was given to the long range planning to achieve solvency of the system. However, there were a number of good recommendations concerning the need for fiscal responsibility, controlled inflation, and the general health of the economy.

12. I felt a lack of coordination at the Conference for the California delegate—little or no direction was provided for committee caucus work and there seemed to be a critical and generally negative tone on the part of some from California. I regret this because we could have exerted greater positive, constructive leadership.

13. However; reading the final report, I am pleased at the overall positive and balanced recommendations. I have received the full report and my questionnaire, and I appreciate the opportunity to respond personally and with time to each recommendation. I feel the time provided in which to respond is adequate.

14. I would like to recommend that attention be given to forming new forums and new coalitions for effectively advocating the needs of the elderly which assures a fair, well balanced cross cut of all of our aging. Aging is not a partisan issue. We need to move ahead in a bipartisan manner to negate the feelings of "them against us" and to seek ways to work together.

15. Those who called, organized and directed this conference are to be commended for overcoming the odds and for producing a volume of challenging and positive recommendations to guide the administration and Congress for future decisionmaking in matters concerning our "greying" population.

I feel honored to have had the opportunity to participate in the 1981 WHCOA and believe me, we will see positive outcomes from this conference.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you.

The next person to testify is Maggie Helton.

Will you proceed?

STATEMENT OF MARGARET HELTON, SAN DIEGO DELEGATE, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING, CHAIRPERSON, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL, FAMILY & COMMUNITY SUPPORT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE

Ms. HELTON. Yes.

I am going to both agree and disagree with the foregoing speakers. I was vice chairman of the California State House conference and was chairman of the San Diego Planning Committee.

I began my first involvement in November 1979. It was a very active 2 years, until the White House Conference.

I would like to say that our delegates were ready. I would like to compliment Governor Brown upon his submission of 63 of his appointments for grassroots election at our State house conference, so that two-thirds of the delegates that were government appointees were elected by the delegates to the State House Conference.

I think that we were ready. However, they were not ready for us. Among the major problems was the difficulty and the lateness in receiving not only your travel information, our committee assignments and technical documents, and so forth, and those have all been spoken to. However, I would like to say these were the factors that contributed and placed great stress on the delegates and observers, due to the uncertainty which prevailed and which led to uncertain tempers and negative feelings toward the Conference before it ever started.

At the Conference, great difficulty was encountered. The travel arrangements were good. However, they were received very late. I would like to say that no plans had been made for the California delegates who arrived Saturday evening. They had made no arrangements at all to inform them of the fact that there were dinner tickets, breakfast and lunch tickets on Sunday, available to them. Most of the California delegates paid for their own dinner on Saturday night and for breakfast and lunch on Sunday. Although there were tickets there and available, they were not told that when they registered.

Also, the rules of order, they were not in the packets. You registered; you got your packet. They did not tell you the rules of order were on the table across the room. You had to rely on another delegate or someone, or, if you were the kind of person—I have been to many seminars—I am the kind that goes around on all tables and looks to see what is available. I found mine immediately. They were there. They are truthful when they say they were there. But I don't call that available if you are not going to tell people they are there.

Many of us went around simply saying, "Have you got your rules of order? They are down there on the table against the back wall."

These are all things that should not happen at a conference such as this.

I will agree poor planning did include the two buffet dinners. I would like to say, being 70 years old, I am very proud of it. Planning a buffet standup reception two times, not just once, but twice, for people who mostly were elderly, was the poorest planning I have ever seen. There were very few chairs in there where people could sit down. And I think plastic plates and the plastic forks were an insult to the Conference, who paid $22.50 for every one of those tickets. The small breakfast, the roll, orange juice and coffee, they paid $6.50 for—in opposition to the sitdown banquet at the Hilton on Wednesday night, which cost $23.50, and everyone was seated and served—a $1 difference between the cost of that buffet and the dinner.

The setup in that room was—on Monday night, they did have some tables across the hall. They had tables with 10 chairs around them. There were no tablecloths on the table. When you sat down—we got there a little late, we sat down, and the centerpiece was a stack of dirty dishes. They made no provision to collect the dirty dishes. You had to hunt for the coffee.

We are being very honest. This is what happened. However, we were determined that these things would not deter us from what we were there to do.

The diversionary tactics were absolutely beautiful. But you had to ignore them. You had to concentrate on what we were doing.

I would like to say that the rumors the very first day on Sunday were running around that the California delegation was going to pull out. I was very proud to be the person to introduce the resolution which stated that the California delegation voted to fully participate, but they wanted those concerned to know it was under protest. We had no intention of walking out. We don't know who started the rumor. But it certainly was not the California delegation.

Also, the California delegation the first night we presented a resolution by which we requested to vote at the end of each committee report. I would like to say that these were presented to the chairman, Mrs. Armitage. No one received any answer, nor were those resolutions ever acknowledged, although we know several States passed the same resolution.

There was no process to provide for resolutions or recommendations to be forwarded from one committee to another. The chairman was all powerful. And we got a lot of—I was on Andy's committee. So, in some ways I am disagreeing with him. The chairman would simply say, "That is not germane to this committee," and it died, unless you were fortunate the next day or that evening to go out and find somebody on another committee that might be willing to introduce it on that committee. There was no process of any kind for referral. And I think that was sad, because we had some good recommendations that simply died in our committee.

Monday morning was the plenary session. I think it is sad at a conference, when the first item out of the chairman's mouth is, "We want to apologize for the buffet last night." It is a heck of a way to start a conference.

Monday afternoon, we went into our committee sessions. In our particular committee, which was No. 7, family and community support systems, the whole afternoon was spent on two speakers. We were speakered to death. We needed speakers like we needed a hole in our head. For 2 years, we had attended conferences and seminars. We had heard speakers. We had been to many, many things to prepare us. And we certainly did not need time wasted on speakers.

The rest of that afternoon was wasted on discussion on the rules of order. There was no agenda. We attempted to put together an agenda. And at that time we had to adjourn.

Tuesday morning, we wasted more time on agenda, rules, procedures, and trivia. Despite the ruling of breaking into subcommittees, I would like to introduce the way ours really happened. What happened was we had Tuesday, at noon, more than 60 resolutions. How do you handle 60 resolutions? And then by the afternoon, after lunch, we had 80.

So, in discussing it, the committee, which was 184 strong, decided that the best way to do, would be to put the resolutions into subject areas. So we put them into areas which included, among others, health, physical, economics, family, spiritual, minority, and I believe there were two others that I don't recall at this time. We took those and gave them to the resource people. The resource people broke them down into those areas.

So then we established groups to use those to discuss and combine and try to come up with from three to five resolutions for each one of those areas. And I might say that Mrs. Alard was tremendous. She was very supportive. We did not go into subcommittees. They were not even really discussion groups. We went into groups to try to consolidate and coordinate those 80 resolutions that we had; that there was no way we could do. They added, subtracted and divided and came up with a much fewer number of resolutions.

However, I do want to say this. The Chair was all powerful. Because of my requests for points of clarification and points of information, I was early identified, I think, as a rebel. So I introduced three resolutions, two of which were lost in the shuffle and never came to a committee. One was—as a matter of fact, I went around to all eight of the subgroups to find out who had one of them. Never could find it. They said, "Well, it probably got lost in the shuffle."

The other one, I was told, was not germane. However, another delegate from California introduced it later. It was accepted and passed. So there were ways that they were watching people and doing things.

I might say that the deepest frustration was felt at the evident wastes resulting, the time on logistics and rules, that took away from discussion, the ignoring of the resolutions that went to the Chair of the Conference, where they were not even given the dignity of a response, the short shrift given to some delegates while others were encouraged and went on and on, arriving with no clear agenda and having to do an agenda after you get there.

The chairman has the agenda ready, and you present it to your group, and you amend or you accept. But to arrive with nothing and have to build an agenda is very poor procedure—with not enough opportunity to discuss or to even study your committee assignment or your materials.

And, as a matter of fact, at the first caucus we had, where there were, I would say, probably more than 150 delegates there, I could find only 5 people—we requested they raise their hand—we could find only 5 people who got their No. 1 committee assignment. Most everyone had gotten their third request or none at all. And that was very, very evident.

The emphasis placed by the Chair and the resource people on reducing the Federal responsibility and increasing the voluntary sector—that was a continual pressure all during the Conference.

I think the saddest thing was the ignoring of the observers who, in the initial information, had been told they could participate fully, except for a vote; who were denied the right to even speak. We had one young lady get up on the last day—we gave the last 30 or 40 minutes of our meeting to the observers to get up and make a statement. And she said that the Conference had cost her over $1,200—she was, I believe, from the Middle West—and she said she was glad she had been there, but she really felt that she had not been treated correctly, and that she was not able to participate.

As a matter of fact, one delegate in our committee asked if they could speak to an observer from their area and was denied the right to go back to speak to the observer; they were told to stay where the delegates were seated.

One thing our committee did that many of them did not: We signed in for every session. We had to check our name when we came in in the morning and when we came in to the after-lunch session. We thought everyone was doing it. We found out they were not.

So Committee No. 7 has a pretty good roll on who was there and who participated. We felt that was a very good deal.

I would like to mention just one other item that came to my attention from one of our California delegates in Health Committee No. 5. There were two men in there bothering her a great deal, because they were standing up and controlling the microphone. You could not walk up to the mike and ask for the Chair. She mentioned them to me.

I thought it was rather interesting. They had a list of the delegates on that committee. The two men concerned, one was Bill Glynn. It was interesting because there was no address. Just "FL" for Florida, and five circles for the ZIP. There was another gentleman in that committee, also, whose name began with "Z," who had the same address. I started checking through the list.

I want to compliment our director in California, who sent us a list of that group for the entire delegation that was early received. And we all had one. I went through it and found there were many who had no address, but a State and a ZIP, and it was rather interesting—Committee No. 5 had 12 of those. That was the Health Committee. Committee No. 6 had 12. Committee No. 8 had 12. That was the Housing Committee. They had a Geraldine Walker from Virginia, who had a "VA" and no ZIP. But there were 12 who gave just the State and a ZIP. I thought that was rather interesting.

I might say that it was a very good feeling when the chairman made their reports to chant "vote." And I also would say that the chairman went right ahead and introduced the chairman of the next committee, ignoring it, and out of politeness and kindness we all stopped chanting when he started to give his report. But we did that after the first five reports and then we just gave up.

And now begins the hardest job of all—implementation and selection of those that are most important.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you very much.

[Ms. Helton's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARGARET HELTON, SAN DIEGO DELEGATE, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING, CHAIRPERSON, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL, FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE

My name is Margaret J. "Maggie" Helton. I live at 162 Mankato Street in the city of Chula Vista, County of San Diego, State of California.

As vice-chair of the Steering Committee for the California State House Conference on Aging, my involvement in the preparation for the White House Conference began in November 1979, and continued to the present time. I served as Chair of the San Diego County Planning Committee. The San Diego delegates and observers met frequently in preparation for the WHCOA. We were ready.

We wish the WHCOA had been as ready as we were.

1. All required forms were completed and returned as required.

2. Major Problems:

A. No committee assignments were made or received until 10 days before the Conference.

B. No hotel confirmation received. You assumed you were housed where your committee was meeting.

C. Materials (technical reports) for Committees received 10 days before the Conference, although they had been ready since the first of July.

D. Plane tickets received 8 days before flight time, leaving little time for planning.

These factors placed great stress on the delegates and observers due to the uncertainty which prevailed and led to uncertain tempers and negative feelings toward the Conference before it occurred.

AT THE CONFERENCE

Great difficulty was encountered in finding caucus rooms. The delegates in attendance at the western caucus on Sunday morning donated to a fund to pay for the room. No plans had been made for the California delegates to be notified that meal tickets for Saturday night and Sunday were available, hence many paid for their own. Poor planning included two buffet dinners—on Sunday—a complete disaster, and on Monday night, not much better.

It speaks poorly for the Conference when the chair (Armitage) apologizes for Sunday night at the official opening plenary session on Monday morning.

The California delegation passed a resolution, as did other States, requesting a vote following each committee report. Those resolutions were ignored, although presented to the chair.

There was no process to provide for resolutions or recommendations to be forwarded from one committee to another, therefore, if the committee chairperson ruled that the resolution or recommendation was not germane to that committee, it died.

Monday afternoon was spent on 2 speakers and more discussion on the rules of order—wasted after 2 years of preparation, we needed speakers like we needed a hole in the head.

Tueday a.m.—more time wasted on agenda rules, procedure, and trivia. Despite the ruling of no breaking into committees, the question became "How do you handle 60 plus resolutions, and so forth." In our committee, 184 strong, 8 discussion groups were assigned the recommendations and worked to add, substract, consolidate, and so forth, to workable size. The areas included health, fiscal, economics, family, spiritual, minority, and so forth.

The Chair was all powerful—if ruled that a resolution was out of order—you simply found someone else to present it.

Deep frustration was felt at: (1) No evident waste of time on logistics and rules, (2) at the ignoring of the resolutions sent to the Chair of the Conference. They weren't even given the respect of a denial, but simply ignored, (3) at the short shift given some delegates while others were encourages, (4) arriving with no clear agenda (more committee time was spent on this item), (5) with no opportunity to study their committee assignment or read the materials (this was extra important inasmuch as we could find only five California delegates who had received their first choice of committee—most had received their third or no choice, (6) at the emphasis placed on reducing Federal responsibility and increasing the volunteer sector, (7) on the ignoring of the observers and separation of delegates and observers at all times, not just at times of voting.

It was a good feeling to chant "Vote" following individual committee Chair reports even though ignored.

Despite the negative reports of the Committees on Economics and Health, it was a good feeling to hear the conflicting votes in other committees. I believe the senior power was there and demonstrated. Despite delegates who gave their address as 000F100000, the seniors were there to work, were prepared and willing to participate. Due to rumors, the first action of the California delegation was to pass a resolution that we were there to participate fully and we wanted those concerned to know it was under protest.

Despite the many frustrations, we were not diverted from our purpose and we felt some measure of success for our hard work in that the resolutions, for the most part, reflected many of our concerns and needs.

Now begins the hardest job of all—the implementation of our Resolutions for the Eighties.

I would compliment Janet Levy, the California Coordinator for her endeavors to keep our delegates informed, most importantly, for the copy of the initial list of the delegates and observers and the committees to which they were assigned. This list assisted in the identification of the newest or latest appointees.

Thank you for the privilege of testifying.

Mr. ROYBAL. The next witness is Barbara Garcia-Weed.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA GARCIA-WEED, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING DELEGATE, MEMBER, OLDER AMERICANS AS A CONTINUING RESOURCE COMMITTEE

Ms. GARCIA-WEED. Congressman Roybal, distinguished guest, honored senior citizens, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Barbara Garcia-Weed. I was a delegate to the 1981 White House Conference on Aging. I also served on the steering committee of the California delegation and in this capacity remained in very close contact with the members of the California delegation as well as those from New York, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and the State of Maine.

I attended several pre-Conference meetings in Ventura, Los Angeles, Sacramento and Phoenix as the delegates sought to clarify their positions on major issues in Washington. Also, in Washington I was a committee member that considered the older Americans as a continuing resource.

My background in the field of aging covers the past 16 years in grassroots, day-to-day association with the problems of the senior community. For the first time in history, a White House conference on aging will produce no major legislation to benefit the senior population. Whereas the 1961 conference developed the Older Americans Act, and the 1971 conference produced the National Institute on Aging, and the basis for the hot meals program, the 1981 White House Conference on Aging will generate no significant legislation to assist the senior Americans in their daily life.

The most significant thing to emerge from the White House Conference on Aging was not the numerous recommendations from the committee, but rather the growing realization that the elderly population has become a political force that can no longer be ignored.

Equally important is the fact the seniors themselves began to realize this and for the first time they began to work as a cohesive group, each member dedicated to the welfare of all. The administration realized this long before the rest of us did and tried to use their influence to protect their interest in the cutting back of Government programs. They attempted to divide the minority members.

They planted several obstacles in the way of delegate on their way to Washington. Some of these could probably be blamed on mismanagement such as committee and hotel assignments, arriving only a couple of weeks before the Conference, and the wholesale hiring and firing of three Executive Directors, the last being appointed within a month of the convening of the Conference.

But the final surprise came with the high-level appointment of 500 delegates who were sympathetic to the administration but who were not experienced in the field of aging and who lacked the year of preparation most of the other delegates had undergone.

There were other disappointments, such as no printed agendas in some committees, lack of microphones and PA systems, which are very important to delegates with decreased ability to hear. There were long food lines, long waits for transportation, and, yes, they, the administration, underestimated the ability and the determination of the senior community, because not surprisingly, all of these difficulties resulted in the welding together of a homogeneous blend that was not dedicated to any particular special-interest group but rather was dedicated to the betterment of the entire group of elderly, without consideration of race or color.

The price of admission was age only. I sat and watched our elderly population with a good deal of pride, respect, and admiration, as they began to realize their potential and begin with persistence and diligence to work through their committees to present well-thought-out and prospective recommendations for the coming decade.

The senior adult of today and tomorrow is neither senile nor stupid. They are well educated and are beginning to discover their true power and will demonstrate it in the voting booths and their lobbying groups as they begin to develop momentum. This is what was significant at the 1981 White House Conference on Aging.

No major legislation changes will come from this committee House conference because we have gone beyond the need for a grandstand gesture to indicate to the rest of the country that the elderly population is alive, healthy, and involved.

What came out of the Conference? Six hundred well-developed recommendations to improve the daily lives of the elderly community and which will also benefit the general population of America. There were no pie-in-the-sky suggestions, only practical suggested solutions to complicated problems. It is one thing to recommend. It is another to implement.

The seniors have given this administration the tools with which to work. Now they will patiently wait for a while until they see what will be done, because the seniors believe in a free democracy, because they believe in America. But be aware, time moves on more rapidly for the elderly. So we would be well advised to waste not much time at all. And remember instead, like our older population, that election time is just around the corner.

Thank you.

Congressman Roybal, I would like to answer a few of your questions that you had that were not answered.

Mr. ROYBAL. Not at this time. We would like to hear from the others and then go into the question period. I want to be sure the statements of each one are recorded.

Ms. GARCIA-WEED. Will I later on be allowed to answer some of the questions made?

Mr. ROYBAL. Only if the Chair makes reference to the same questions. We do not want to go back to the questioning process which already took place with another panel. In order to keep the record straight, we must follow the procedure.

Ms. GARCIA-WEED. Congressman, if it is a new issue being brought up that was not answered that the chairman himself asked, could it be answered after everyone has spoken?

Mr. ROYBAL. Probably so. The best way to handle that would be to submit that in writing. May I state at this time, any delegate or any person in this room or anyone in the United States who so desires can submit for the record any statements, any questions, or answer to a question that has been asked. The record will remain open for 30 days after today. We will receive any communication that you may direct to us and make it part of the record at that time.

The next witness is Helen Huber.

STATEMENT OF HELEN HUBER, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING DELEGATE, MEMBER, PUBLIC SECTOR ROLES AND STRUCTURES COMMITTEE

Ms. HUBER. Thank you, Congressman. In the interests of time, and the concern of everyone in the audience, because it has been a long time, I will certainly try and shorten my remarks. Some of the things I would like to underscore, I certainly do not want to duplicate anything said before. I would like to refer to the fact that Dr. Weg mentioned at the plenary session we were given speeches and information and also at the first day's session I believe in almost every committee this happened, they gave us information when we were there as the "experts." There were people in that audience, delegates, who have written the textbooks. And I find it very insulting and timeconsuming to take that kind of time, when we would have preferred to use it in committee.

As the cochairman of the San Diego delegation, I would like to indicate to you, Congressman Roybal, that it is our full intention to continue as a delegation. We have already met since returning from Washington, D.C. We have another meeting scheduled next week with our delegation. We have been in contact with our Congressman from our area. We met with him in Washington. They invited us to breakfast. We will continue to be in contact with them prior to their returning to Washington.

I, too, felt highly intimidated. I felt frightened at times. I felt that it was a draining conference, as Dr. Weg referred to that. There was a great deal of frustration and there was tension. I also was very angered by the fact that it seemed to me and to three other people who were in our delegation that the telephone of our reporter was being tapped when we were conversing with him about the Conference.

Very happily, I was assigned to the committee of my first choice; that is, the concerns of older women. I think perhaps we were fortunate in that we were able to function to some degree in a better manner than some of the other committees apparently were able to. And I think perhaps—and I say this with great seriousness—that it may be because they don't take women very seriously, and they didn't think we would accomplish as much as we were able to accomplish. This was true not only in Washington, D.C., but in Sacramento. I am very proud of that fact.

There were frustrations. I remember very distinctly the frustration of Dr. Weg, and one of the other observers who went from the San Diego delegation who was an observer—they were not allowed the time to speak they had been promised they would.

These people who came as observers paid their own way, were obviously very caring, and were definitely very well informed, much more so and much better informed than some of the very, very late appointments that were made to these committees as delegates. I feel in the future it is important to give those observers an opportunity to speak. And I think they have been very, very seriously neglected back in Washington at this time.

I think that is all I want to say at this time. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Roybal. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Toni Rini.

STATEMENT OF TONI RINI, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING DELEGATE, APPOINTED BY REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD R. ROYBAL

Ms. Rini. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Toni Rini. I was a delegate to Washington appointed by Congressman Roybal. I am also vice president of region 6 of the Congress of Senior Citizens. I work very closely with the senior citizens.

I will try to be brief and not to repeat what some of the other people have said. So I will just speak about one little experience I had in Washington.

The committee that I had selected was health care, but I was assigned to the concerns of older women. It gave me a chance to advocate health care. When I turned in my paper, one of the staff persons said it is not germane. I said, oh, yes, it is. Again she said no. She had the power to accept or reject the presentation of proposals or papers. I said politely but firmly, I want to speak to the chairperson or I will have to speak to my Congressman.

She said, all right, I will give the paper to her. We had an agenda listing the time to speak on the different issues. When it came my turn to speak, the chairperson stated two other persons had a similar paper and for us to get together in the hall and agree as to which one of us would present our proposal. We did just that.

The lady and the gentleman decided that I present my paper, which they signed—but to add low-vision care to my request which is on page 5 of women's concerns, that Congress adopt legislation to amend medicare and medicaid to include pharmaceuticals, necessary medical equipment and supplies, low-vision care, podiatry, hearing aid, basic dental care and necessary transportation for health care for older persons, especially older women on medicare and medicaid programs.

The reason I am doing this is because that is right down your line. So to emphasize, I have repeated what is here on page 5 among the concerns, No. 445.

The next day when it was my turn to speak, the chairperson stated my paper had been misplaced or lost. I said, "Madam Chairman, do not exert yourself or waste your time or money. I have a copy for you, and I know it by heart." I also said what I lack in knowledge, I make up in tenacity. I received a great applause. My proposal was acted upon unanimously.

It was very rewarding to have the support of other delegates sincerely concerned with the needs of senior citizens. But three delegates kept asking about fiscal impact, financial trouble, what would it cost. Again I got the floor and I said, what does it cost to send a person to the hospital or convalescent home when we can have preventive medicine, preventive programs that will save the seniors from landing there. I said, how much is a life worth? Again, another applause. So these people subsided.

I believe this was only the beginning of our work, and we must follow through and work with and support city, county, State and Federal legislators who are concerned with senior citizens' problems and who will try to solve these problems by a firm legislative effort.

Thank you, Congressman, for appointing me as a delegate and also for inviting me to testify today. I promise you I shall keep on working diligently for us seniors.

Hasta luego.

Mr. Roybal. Thank you very much.

So far the committee has heard testimony from various individuals. Some have been complimentary and some have not. The purpose of the hearing, of course, is to hear both sides. We realize we cannot go back and remedy any situation that existed during the Conference. We are interested in making certain recommendations, based on your testimony, hoping that those who plan the White

House Conferences in years to come will go back to some of this testimony and avoid making the same mistakes.

So far we have heard both sides. We have heard, I think, strong criticism from those who found the Conference favorable as well as those who found the Conference unfavorable.

So you have given the commmittee a great deal to work with.

On the other hand, I don't think either the subcommittee or the full committee would be here today or would be interested in holding hearings throughout the country if the hearings were just designed to criticize and not to bring out some of the positive things. I think almost everyone has given the committee the impression that while you went through certain periods of unrest, you still came back with a positive feeling that the 600 recommendations were made in a positive vein.

I would like statements such as the following to be implemented. My committee is going to continue to meet; we are angry enough to continue meeting even as a State delegation, and make these recommendations, to set out priorities so that the Congress can take cognizance of the fact that a State delegation has certain priorities with regard to the recommendations that were made.

I would not be here if I didn't think some significant piece of legislation could and will come out of this Conference. I think it is the general opinion that this can come about. It has to come about, at least from what I see now. Bulldog tenacity was displayed on the part of many delegates who did things in spite of the fact that there were rules, for example, prohibiting subcommittees to form. So many of these things did happen.

They are probably part of an overall mistake in some instances. Others may have been deliberate. Whatever the reason, I think we have to look forward now to the more positive aspects of this Conference, and ask ourselves what are we going to do about it.

I am going to ask some questions to perhaps illicit concrete recommendations regardless of whether you think the Conference was good or bad. You have recommendations. In a 1-minute statement, I would like each one of you to tell me what you think we should do. I am talking about us, the subcommittee—the full Committee on Aging, plus the Congress of the United States. Can you give us an answer? Each one of you will be given only 1 minute to answer that question.

Dr. WEG. I think I can speak without the microphone and say that a number of the persons who spoke earlier gave their recommendations, with which I concur, that there would need to be an oversight and the followup. I would love to see the accounting of how that money was spent, I really would. The oversight on our followthrough. I would like to see meeting held before 1991.

I would like to see it in 3 or 4 years. I would like to have an independent group—I concur with that recommendation. And also that it be extended, the time for response be extended to either February 15, or the end of February.

Most of the recommendations that were made I had already written down and I think this demonstrates to you how we are thinking together. Thank you.

Mr. ROYBAL. All right. Miss Kirby.

Ms. **Kirby**. I think it is important we don't lose our impact and energy and that we have a continuous ongoing process, whether it be at the local, State, or national level. I would urge Congress to come to grips with the problems of the economy. This is what is killing the old people.

Mr. **Roybal**. What recommendation did your full committee make with regard to the economy?

Ms. **Kirby**. One of our major recomendations was that you focus on bringing inflation, which is the cruelest tax of all, under control; that you work to make social security a fiscally reliable program for those who are now in it as well as those contributing to it; and that there be no cuts made in social security.

Mr. **Roybal**. Did it make any recommendations with regard to budget deficits?

Ms. **Kirby**. We did indicate you cannot bail out one bankrupt system with another bankrupt system. So it is the total economy that has to be brought under control.

Mr. **Roybal**. Mrs. Garcia-Weed.

Ms. **Garcia-Weed**. I would like to see Congress legislate, and Senators, get on with it. The older American community has done the work. They have done the backup. They have done their homework.

I may make one suggestion, and be so bold and correct me, respected seniors, please correct me. I think there is one thing that you can do, because social security was addressed in 13 of the committees—if you have read your book that has come out. And it was addressed with over 52 different recommendations by the older community.

So I won't go into social security. But I would like to see a recommendation by you that would elevate the aging department to a full cabinet status so that the older population will have an ear directly to the President of the United States, and so that the seniors will no longer have to have politicians do the work for them.

Thank you.

Mr. **Roybal**. Thank you.

May I say that such a proposal is already in the hopper. I presented the first resolution, the first bill establishing that department. Nothing has happened yet. We hope we can continue on its implementation.

Mr. **Roybal**. Mrs. Huber.

Mrs. **Huber**. Thank you, Congressman.

I would just simply like to underscore what has already been said here several times. Please let us have some kind of a committee that will watchdog the report that is coming out now and our responses to it. I again would agree with Dr. Weg. I would very much like to see a meeting begin in a very much earlier period of time than another 10 years. I think 10 years is going to be too long with the change in the adult population now.

Mr. **Roybal**. Thank you. Miss Helton.

Miss **Helton**. Again, I would concur with the recommendations on oversight that was put together by several of the members who spoke. Also I concur with the suggestion by Dr. Weg that an evaluation by the Congress Committee on Aging should be done in about 3 years to find out what has been accomplished and what still remains to be accomplished. I think it is very important that we keep an oversight on how these priorities are selected to be handled.

Also on the State level, I would like to urge that we all continue to work and that we try to implement some of the recommendations through the California Legislature and our state legislators and also with our California Department on Aging.

I would like to say, Congressman, we felt our hearing was important enough that four of us came from San Diego to be present.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you very much.

Ms. RINI. I concur with the ladies here. Saying 5 years, 10 years to see what has been accomplished, what has been implemented—I believe this can be a very dirty house. You have to sweep your house every day or it is going to get very dirty. The same thing with all the problems we have in government.

It is a day-to-day thing. A year is not too soon to see what has been done, what has been implemented of all these resolutions and proposals we have worked so hard with. Also, it should be through our legislation here in Sacramento, it should be at the city, county, and so on up, and we should keep in very close touch with our legislators, and keep pushing.

It says, seek and thou shalt find. This is where we have to work hard. We have to hit where it is going to hurt. And it is going to be at the ballot box.

Mr. ROYBAL. The reason I asked each one of you to make a 1-minute statement with regard to your recommendations is that at the end of this hearing I am also going to give those in the audience the opportunity to make a 1-minute statement. That means you have already made yours, and therefore you will not be heard.

Those who have already testified will also not be heard. So you see, that is the procedure. I wish to thank you all for excellent testimony.

The committee, of course, will take all the testimony into consideration and make recommendations.

Mr. ROYBAL. The next panel will consist of Dr. James Birren, Dr. Percil Stanford, and Mr. Morris Better.

Will you please come forward.

I would like to hear from the witnesses in the following order: First Dr. James Birren, then Dr. Stanford, and then Mr. Better.

Will Dr. Birren proceed.

STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES BIRREN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, AND DELEGATE, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Dr. BIRREN. Thank you.

I am James Birren. I was a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging because of my role as chairman of the Technical Committee on Research. My position is head of the Gerontology Center at the University of Southern California.

I would like to congratulate this committee because I think the log of history is now in the hands of this committee and the prospects for the future, I think, by and largely are in your hands.

I had a feeling this morning in listening to some of the comments this was a postmortem; but then I changed my concept to autopsy. We are trying to see why something died. But I hope that point of view won't become widespread, because you sense the vigor, a great deal of national interest.

I am going to be brief—I would like to take a few moments.

What should we do differently the next time? I think it should be a little sooner. I think there is difficulty in having a White House Conference in the first year of the new Presidential administration. It catches them short. You can see many of the inadvertencies. I would like to see it placed in the beginning, say, of the third year so that the whole tone would be a little bit more temperate.

I think that the haste began in the latter days of the Carter administration in which various groups had to prepare their reports. So we have parallel channels of information with no crosstalk.

For example, let me use the Research Committee to illustrate this. We had miniconferences around the country. Some of them had research issues. We did not have that material available in the Research Committee. Furthermore the National Institute of Aging was preparing a national plan for research on aging. That was the third parallel channel.

That material did not become available until the day of the Conference. That is unfortunate. And I think next time we should be certain we lay it out in the sequential form, so we can react to the miniconferences and the regional meetings and take advantage of that.

With regard to the process, I had the impression at this time that the process of picking delegates originally was in good shape. I had no quarrel with that. Those plans that were laid out 2 years in advance of the White House Conference.

With regard to the Research Committee's report, we turned in our report February 1980. I did not ever receive a copy until I came to the meeting of the report that I submitted. Furthermore, when I came to the meeting, I was assigned to the Committee on the Private Sector. I had never served in the private sector. I spent 35 years of my career in research.

When I went to the Research Committee, since I thought I could add something there, I was challenged at the door, and then I was told by the chairman that I could be there as an observer, but I could not vote. There is something wrong about that process. I am not protesting from my own ego at the moment. But there is something wrong in not making the background information available to the committee. And I think that is a waste of dollars and efforts.

I would also like, in addition to the ideas already mentioned of having a White House Conference sooner, I would not like it too soon. And I would like to have, in addition to the Select Committee on Aging, have some agency in the Federal Government assigned the work, to have some staff also engaging in a postmortem analysis, but also look forward to the future, so that in perhaps 2 to 3 years it would make a recommendation to the Congress about the process, content, timing, the input-output relationships to the White House Conference.

Now, the difficulty that results when you have so many parallel inputs all coming in at the last moment to delegates that are not necessarily prepared, I was not prepared. The report from the Research Committee has I believe 96 recommendations alone. Some of them are overlapping. There is no sorting out. I feel it very difficult even to vote on those 96 alone. And I feel somewhat expert in that area. Let alone the entire 668 recommendations. I think it is impossible. So there is something wrong in a professional sense, wrong with this process.

Now, another point about the political overtones. I think a White House Conference on Aging is always to some extent political, but in a desirable sense of the expression of social political impressions and opinions. That is the best of America.

But it should not become political in the sense of party politics. That is where the mistake can enter.

My last point here. There were some foreign observers at the White House Conference on Aging. There was a World Health Organization committee meeting at the same time, and some of the delegates were watching us. So I had the opportunity of asking one from Europe, "How does the White House Conference on Aging seem to you?" And this person was the head of a gerontology institute in Europe. And he said, "It could never happen in our country, our older people would not be prepared for it, and they would be passive."

Now, that is an interesting point and one that I think is flattering to the sophistication of the American public. We are prepared for the open forum, and that indeed was where the strength of this Conference was.

I think I would stop at that point. Thank you very much.

Mr. **Roybal.** Thank you, Dr. Berrin.

Dr. Stanford.

STATEMENT OF DR. PERCIL STANFORD, SAN DIEGO DELEGATE, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING, MEMBER, EDUCATION AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES COMMITTEE

Dr. **Stanford.** Mr. Chairman, my name is Percil Stanford. I am the director of the Center on Aging of San Diego State University and was a delegate to the Conference by virtue of my role as a member of the National Advisory Committee.

I think the points that have been made regarding the accommodations, the general quality of the Conference, certainly have been presented in balance. But I think what I would like to do is concentrate more on what I would like to look at as some of the followup, some of the quality as far as substance is concerned.

In planning the Conference, there was certainly adequate attention given to the before and during aspects of the conference. However, there was not enough attention given the after-Conference aspects.

It seems to me that one of the important issues before us now for the future is to begin to address what kind of meaningful process in a structured fashion can take place after the Conference to insure that some of the things that should take place take place.

We seem to be asking ourselves the question where to, what happens after the Conference, what happens after the recommendations.

So I think one of the key things that we might do at this point is to insure in some fashion that the planning process formally include three stages.

Further, I would like to suggest that what has happened is another rung in the ladder as far as the furthering of national policy development in aging. The attitudes that we have seen exhibited by delegates says to me that we are on the track to continuing to develop the basis for national policy or national policies in aging. We must look at the existing structure in order to positively proceed and ask ourselves who can best follow up, and how that followup can take place.

I would like to offer not anything new in some instances, but at least some suggestions.

One is that there must be a process whereby the Federal Council or some other body identify those issues, those recommendations that are feasible from the standpoint of administrative changes immediately. We do not have to wait for legislative changes. There are many executive changes that can be made, there are some administrative changes that can be made.

I think Dr. Torres-Gil who mentioned the Federal Council might play a role is very correct in that sense, working with the various departments. I think that can be done immediately.

At another level, I think the persons who have been identified and elected in California and in one or two other States as senior legislators have a very, very important role to play. It is the older persons themselves in roles like this that will be most instrumental in seeing that some of the followthrough does take place, not only at the State level, but also at the national level.

Another issue or set of issues that were not mentioned was the fact that the national aging organizations did identify what they called aid for the eighties. Those issues were very, very prominent throughout the White House Conference on Aging. And those issues were in many ways addressed and, in most instances, there were resolutions or recommendations passed that did support those ideas. I mentioned that primarily because the national organizations that passed those aid for the eighties recommendations represent most of the older people in our society and many of the professional organizations. So I think those should be kept in mind as we move ahead.

From another standpoint, we are talking about dissemination of information. I think we have to come out and be much more clear about our intent. What we are talking about is keeping the public informed as to what transpires as we go through this after the conference process. I think there should be a very clear process spelled out whereby the public will be made aware of the various steps as Congress moves ahead.

I think the aging network as it exists is an excellent avenue for that process. Why not use the State units on aging, why not use the area age agencies on aging and the various districts that have been designated? So I think we can use a process that is in place.

Further, we have already heard that many delegates at various levels are planning to continue their involvement. It seems to me that there could be support, formal support, for supporting the efforts of those delegates, of those persons who want to further this process. I do not think it should be an informal process. I think it should be a formalized process whereby those who put their time in, their effort in before the Conference, can have the intended responsibility of followup effort, and not be a process of saying "if we can." It should be that "we will," and we have a mandate to do so.

Another aspect is the media. I think it was demonstrated at the White House Conference on Aging that the media at its various levels, whether it be printed, television, what have you, can have a tremendous impact. And it seems to me that we must orchestrate the media and use media effectively in the afterconference process as well.

So, in closing, I think we have made some strides, we have added maybe perhaps a half rung or another rung to the ladder in terms of moving toward a national policy in aging and insuring that older people can live with dignity.

Thank you.

Mr. **Roybal**. Thank you, Dr. Stanford.

The next witness is Mr. Morris Better.

STATEMENT OF MORRIS BETTER, NATIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE, GRAY PANTHERS, AND DELEGATE AT LARGE, 1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mr. **Better**. Mr. Chairman, and durable cohorts, I am delighted to have the opportunity to appear before this committee, especially on this panel dealing with followup.

Before I conclude my remarks, I hope to have some recommendations both as to procedures, the conduct of the conference, and also some possible legislative action by the Congress.

I should identify myself. I am Morris Better. I am a voluntarily retired professor of education. I am a member of the national steering committee of the Gray Panthers. I was the delegate at large from the Gray Panther organization. I also coordinated the Gray Panther activities and efforts with regard to the White House Conference on Aging. That latter responsibility began 1½ years ago when the whole process for the 1981 White House Conference on Aging began.

The Gray Panthers, as everybody knows, is an activist organization. Because we are an activist organization, we took a look at the potential prospects of the White House Conference on Aging a long time ago to see whether we could play our expected role, that is of a watchdog function, something that we characteristically do with all Government agencies and with our elected officials. I think it is important you understand my remarks in that context.

An air of mistrust prevailed going into the Conference. That air of mistrust prevailed during the White House Conference on Aging. And it is evident that the air of mistrust still prevails.

The evidence of that, humorously, when our plane leaving Los Angeles was delayed for almost 2 hours, we felt this was the long hand of the administration reaching out to keep us, the California delegation, from getting there. Engine failure, we even surmised that the warranty had run out on us.

The clumsy approach to manipulating the conference that Jerry Waldie pointed out, the heavyhandedness of the handling of the

Conference, demonstrated the attitude of this administration in many things that they do. That is, when there is a choice between brains and guts, guts seems to get the vote. Unfortunately this time they met their match, as far as guts and activity is concerned.

I would characterize the Conference, from a personal point of view, two ways. One, I missed a lot of naps during the Conference. And the other was very heartening to see a lot of people acting and talking as though they were Gray Panthers.

This is a reaction, again, to the way in which the attempts were made to control the Conference.

I would characterize the product of the Conference—that is, the resolutions that came out of the Conference—as primarily one of being able to hold on to the gains that we achieved as a result of earlier Conferences. We were successful in resisting the encroachments. But we were not successful really in breaking any new ground. I think it is important to realize that as well.

The Conference was also, as many people have testified before me, an exercise in trivializing older people, both in the way we were corraled and marshaled around—even to the entertainment that we were provided.

One of the best kept secrets of the Conference was how the delegate appointment was made to membership organizations. Because of my role in the Gray Panthers, I was concerned about how many delegates we would obtain. We had a hard time getting that information. And I guess what I am saying now is a little bit unique, in contrast to what has preceded today, because I speak as a delegate from a membership organization.

I did not learn until today when I talked to Leon Harper that the allotment of delegates to national organizations was 75, grand total, they were handed to the Leadership Council and told to distribute them as they saw fit among the supporting organizations, not all of which incidentally belonged to the Leadership Council. Some of these membership organizations number in the millions. And yet they received only two or three delegates. I was one of two delegates representing the Gray Panthers.

Gray Panthers are concerned that the efforts on the part of the administration to control and manipulate the conference be fully exposed. I commend the work this committee is doing now as a step in that direction, and I hope they would see the necessity to proceed further on this basis.

As I had written to you, Congressman Roybal, and to other Congressmen who are on the Select Committee on Aging, the developments that have been revealed here today introduce strong doubts and suspicions that the purpose of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging Act to develop a comprehensive, coherent national policy on aging, together with recommendations for the implementation of that policy, has been seriously tampered with, if not completely subverted. And I would urge it is the legitimate role of the Congress to take a further look into that. As a matter of fact, it is really a corruption of the Conference purposes.

The Gray Panthers, I feel free to reveal, are looking into possible illegalities. For example, invasion of privacy in the nature of the survey on the part of the National Steering Committee. The defamation of character that came as a result of being listed on so-called adversaries or enemies list.

How nearly do they approach being illegal acts? We have asked the National Senior Citizens Law Center to determine what latitude we have in that direction.

We are also exploring the possibility of using the Freedom of Information Act to see what documents can be obtained to further substantiated suspicions that have been demonstrated.

By way of recommendations, and with regard to the conduct of the Conference itself, the effort to co-op the conference, I would suggest that the Congress make some determination of what criteria for selection were used by the administration in selecting their 11th-hour appointees. Was age a consideration? Was the urban-rural distribution a consideration? Was gender a consideration? To what extent was it a complete disregard of the gridlines so scrupulously used previously with all the other delegates?

I would urge the Congress to look into the existence of a delegate control section within the White House Conference on Aging structure.

It was brought to my attention, it didn't come out at this meeting, that a delegate control section existed, and that was off limits to most of the people who worked in the planning of the White House Conference, the staff.

It is my understanding also that the responsibility of the delegate control section was to carefully build the membership of the committees. I learned, for example, that the first people to be appointed to committees were people with business orientations and even notified of their committee assignments 3 to 4 weeks ahead of the other members of the various committees. I would ask the Congress to try to substantiate that.

Also to look into what advanced briefing these delegates received, how the assignments were made, what responsibilities were doled out, what strategies were developed. And further, how were the expenses of these delegates defrayed. One California delegate brought two staff members with him. By what means were committee chairs provided and analyses of the delegates in each of their committees so that they knew what percentage were favorable and what percentage were unfavorable. And, of course, how was the list, the so-called enemies list, the favorables and unfavorables developed.

I would suggest that testimony from many of these delegates try to be solicited and to collate all the evidence available to see whether these are really political ploys, or to what extent it borders on illegal acts.

With regard to issues, I would like to make the following recommendations.

When the debate develops on the role of the private sector in our society, as the Government seeks to reduce its responsibility in social services to all segments, I would urge the Congress to see to it that movement in that direction be carefully phased in, that we don't merely cut off social services and say trust us that the private sector will fill the gap.

I think if we want to get the private sector involved, then I would suggest that some careful legislative action be taken so that one moves in as the other moves out and not before.

I would also suggest that we look to see what the potential is of age integration in our society. The 1971 White House Conference put its foot in the door. For the first time, it raised the question about age integration, about age desegregating our society.

The technical committees prepared seven reports with that particular emphasis. And yet nothing emerged in the way of recommendations from the White House Conference. I would submit that that was due largely to the fact that much of our time and energy was spent in confrontation rather than breaking in new ground. Had there been no confrontation, I imagine we would have addressed ourselves to questions of age integration.

I would suggest that also we would have addressed ourselves more fully to the matter of military budget, and to determine how moral or immoral it seems to be, as yesterday's paper indicated, a 15-percent increase for military expenditures while they are talking about 11-percent further decrease in the 1983 budget for social services.

I would urge that the Congress at present do everything it can to resist encroachments on existing policies that affect older people.

In conclusion, I would like to suggest one idea that may be just a little bit ahead of its time, but someone has to say it first, and maybe I will be that person.

I would urge that future White House Conferences not be addressed to segments of our society, but rather to overriding issues in our society. So, for example, we would have a White House Conference on Housing or a White House Conference on Health, and deal with the issues as it impinges on all segments of our society, the young and the old.

I will leave it for your thought.

Mr. Roybal. Thank you, Mr. Better, for your excellent testimony. As I go over some of my notes, I find that you three gentlemen with vast experience in various universities have similar philosophies. You are united with regard to the future of the Conference, the future of the senior citizens.

However, I find that there has to be some clarification on some of the statements that were made.

You all agree that senior citizens should continue in their involvement. The clarification needed is in the type of involvement.

Dr. Stanford, I think you said that the involvement should be formal. Will you tell the committee what you meant by formal?

Dr. Stanford. I think one of the great injustices has been that we have expected the older person to volunteer or give his or her time to many, many matters. To formalize this followup process, I would suggest that there be minimal resources made available for committees to continue to work, to provide some kind of support for people to meet, to produce followup documents, to make telephone calls or whatever, so there can be some concrete activity to move the information to communicate. That is the kind of formal teeth that I would say be put into this matter.

Mr. Roybal. What I would like to see is, of course, a committee of that kind on a national scale with perhaps representation from the various States. The end result would be the formulation of a proposal of some kind that would, first of all, discuss the discrepancies—some of the things that went on that were not quite right—and discuss recommendations that would be made by that national committee on future Conferences.

My main interest would be in recommendations that come not only from those on that committee, but, for example, from students who would be getting their masters and Ph. D.'s in gerontology, involving them fully, since they are going to be tomorrow's leaders in this field.

You stated that such a formal commission would cost money. You are right, but if we don't spend it, we are not going to take it with us, and we are liable not to reach a consensus with regard to the problems of the senior citizen.

I say that, in view of the fact that Mr. Better said that the military budget has increased by 15 percent, and that the social budget has further decreased by 11 percent.

In viewing the budget cuts in education and social programs and comparing them to increased military spending, I see little hope of establishing something brandnew that will address itself as a commission to the problems of the aging in the United States.

Let us assume that I am right. Let us assume, yes, there is no possibility of getting the funds for such a project.

I would ask the $64 question. What else can be done to accomplish the same objectives with perhaps partial funding of some kind. Is that a possibility?

What about a combination of Government, senior citizens, and the educational community? Perhaps the taller could be involved in some kind of a commission, to do the job through a combination of partial funding and voluntary basis. Is that a $64 question that perhaps has an answer?

Dr. **Birren**. I am not certain I can answer it, but let me try.

One advantage of being a little bit older is that you do develop a sense of history. I attended the first National Conference on Aging, which was 1951, then the Federal Security Agency. I acquired little bits of knowledge along the way, I hope.

The basic issue administratively has always been do you distribute the issues of aging across all agencies and, therefore, it has no focus.

Frequently it gets buried then because no one has the responsibility. They all claim they are doing very much on behalf of the aging, whether it is health, housing, or education.

So there needs to be a focus with some notion of accountability. For me the final denominator of accountability is Congress.

Now France has recently appointed a Minister of Aging which is an interesting development. It is along your line of having a Cabinet officer.

The cabinet officer, if there were such a post, couldn't do everything. So there is a question of how do you integrate the specialists and make them accountable?

Now an example I like to use, it is a little bit homely, is the post office syndrome. When I was a boy, the post office in our society was a respected institution. You trusted it. It was a sign of responsibility and it only took 2 cents to mail a first-class letter.

Now, today, almost everyone is criticizing it, and it is run down. It did not take out what I would say is a desirable amount of money in its budget for research and development to improve and anticipate the future, about 1 percent.

It assumed that they knew exactly how services were going to be always developing.

In this field we are going to have higher expectations of services in health education. So we have to reserve about 1 percent for R. & D. to make the future not only better, but more efficient.

Now the assignment of responsibility is the issue. Under the old Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it was assumed that you could assign these responsibilities to the agencies. I discovered when I was dealing with it that the Housing Agency did not want to have a health clinic in a housing project because they only dealt with housing.

That kind of rigidity—well, somewhere in there I hope is a touch of something that makes some sense.

Mr. **Roybal**. Most definitely. I think I followed you very well.

Dr. Stanford, do you have anything to add to this? This being an election year, you can just say "I agree with the previous speaker."

Dr. **Stanford**. I do agree with the previous speaker. However, I think we should take into consideration the existing structures and examine those structures fully to see to what extent those structures can be used because I think quite often we assume that existing structures may not be viable. I think it is how we use those structures and I think if we go back and take a look at the organizations and the public agencies that are now in existence, that most people know about, if we could ever put a new twist to those, and make those more viable, I think we might even save some money.

Mr. **Roybal**. Mr. Better, what is your opinion?

Mr. **Better**. I would cite an experience I had in my committee, "The Older American as a Continuing Resource," where I noted that all of the deliberations and discussion had to do with how do we fit older people into existing modes and existing mechanisms.

It was my thought that perhaps we could use the intelligence and wisdom and insights of older people to begin to explore avenues of social change, other ways of doing things, and open up options.

I think the more options we have, the greater the opportunity for self-determination. It takes a great deal of cooperation, certainly, between all agencies, Congress and the private sector and the voluntary sector, but I think that is a direction worth striving for.

The error I feel we are making is that we are terminating one element before we are turning on the other ones.

In other words, it has to be a coordinated effort so that nothing falls in the cracks in the meantime, and there is no undue suffering as a result of that.

Mr. **Roybal**. One question directed to all three of you. I am not an educator, therefore I don't know the time it would take for someone to make a thorough study of the conference and come up with certain recommendations in a proposal that would be made to the Congress of the United States.

How long would it take one scholar, one, let's say a candidate for Ph. D. in gerontology, as an example, to complete such a study? Would it take a full 2 years?

Mr. BETTER. You mean a study of what happened at this conference?

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes. What I am interested in seeing is a young scholar somewhere perform the necessary study, get his Ph. D. at the same time, and then come up with the gerontologists's viewpoint of what happened. This young person should capture the spirit of the situation by talking to the senior citizens of his community, therefore reflecting not only the opinion of the senior citizens, but reflecting also the opinion of that young individual who will be in a key position to do something about these problems if we are able to pass some of the recommendations that have been made.

That is what I am trying to get at.

I am interested in that approach. I would like to see the universities more involved in this process.

Mr. STANFORD. I had a student who did a study for the White House Conference on Aging, although the output was lost, on the evolution of Federal policy on aging. And it took that student about 6 months to get deeply acquainted with the literature.

Several of the Congressmen helped us with materials.

I would make a point there is a new concept in education and that is the team dissertation. I would suggest a team of three could break it up into digestible components and also be stimulating one to another. Two years is about the right time.

Mr. ROYBAL. The reason I ask these questions is that I think we have facilities that can be made available in Washington for interns coming from universities to participate in such a program, but that internship only lasts 1 year. I was asking this question hoping that the time element would fit into the facilities that we now have.

I would like to add just one more point.

That is, do you think this is a proper procedure? Do you think this is something this committee can recommend?

Dr. STANFORD. I feel very strongly that that type of process would be something that would be most instructive for not only future conferences, but it would also be very helpful in understanding why some of the things happen, the way they happen in this conference.

It would also give some clues as to perhaps why the recommendations follow the patterns that they follow.

I think it would be very instructive also if you would have not only the subjective aspects of it, but a very good statistical accounting of what happened.

Mr. ROYBAL. That is the analysis that I think I would like to see because we heard testimony sometime during the day that the recommendation made by my committee followed almost to the letter recommendations made by the so-called research committee that made recommendations to them.

I would like to know why and how that happened. And perhaps an analysis of the situation would be most helpful, not only to those in the field, but to Members of Congress. We don't have that facility. We cannot get into this. I am just looking for a ray of light at the end of the tunnel, hoping that somewhere down the line through the cooperation of existing agencies we can get such a job done.

If you have any final 1-minute statement that you would like to make, I would be happy to hear it. If that is not the case, we will then go on to the next witness.

May I then thank each and every one of you. I would like to announce at this time that we are going to go to the 1-minute session. The microphone will be placed in the center. When that minute is up, the gavel will go down. That will be the end of the statement.

All those who wish to make a 1-minute statement, please line up before the microphone, and be recorded as part of the testimony.

STATEMENT OF LOIS HAMER, VAN NUYS, CALIF.

Ms. **Hamer**. Lois Hamer. I live at 6912 Bevis Avenue, Van Nuys. I am extremely sensitive to the fact that we need to address the economic situation in our country. I am particularly concerned that a good deal of the information that is available in the needs of the country, both economically, socially and militarily, seem not to be coordinated.

The Center for Defense Information in Washington, which is probably one of the most definitive areas in this area, suggests that between the Soviet Union and the United States we have the capability, nuclearly, of destroying the world 43 times, and yet our new military budget calls for a 15-percent increase in R. & D. new weapons, and so forth.

It would seem to me that we need very strongly to urge the Congress to be responsible in this area, take a good look at the needs, social needs that are being cut, and that we recognize the fact that survival in a dignified manner is much more important than the ability to destroy the world over and over.

Thank you.

Mr. **Roybal**. Next.

STATEMENT OF AMALIA GUERRERO, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Ms. **Guerrero**. Amalia Guerrero from Los Angeles.

I am a community worker in East Los Angeles. Today I am a little concerned because we didn't have more of our Hispanic community here at the hearing. But I am very glad I came, because I have been hearing very negative things about what happened in Washington, and being here today gave me a little ray of hope because I think with the caliber and the tenacity of the delegates that the recommendations that were made surely will be followed.

I think one of the things I hear here is the lack of enforced coordination of the different services to the elderly and I agree totally that it should exist because there are services out there, but for some reason or another they are denied to the elderly.

I want to thank you very much for having this hearing, and getting a more optimistic view of what happened in Washington. Thank you very much.

Mr. **Roybal**. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ZELDA ELIOT, PALM SPRINGS, CALIF.

Ms. **Eliot.** My name is Zelda Eliot. I live in Palm Springs.

I was a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging. I want to preface my remarks by saying I have served on another White House Conference, the one on small business.

We did not have the problems that existed in this conference. I was amazed at what I went through.

I think Mr. Better put it the best way. He said the time was spent in confrontation instead of breaking new ground, which is what happened.

We arrived, the California people, on Saturday. We did not have a plenary session until Monday, but all the time was spent prior to the plenary session girding for battle.

The determination to have the votes counted after the session was over, there were 668 recommendations.

Do you realize what time consuming and confrontations there would have been? It was an impossible factor. It threw all of us off just a little bit.

I don't think any of us worked as efficiently as we would have.

Mr. **Roybal.** Thank you.

STATEMENT OF FRANK DWYER, SANTA MARIA, CALIF.

Mr. **Dwyer.** Frank Dwyer from Santa Maria.

I am glad I have the opportunity to speak to one issue.

I think two priorities people are really concerned about—the economic problem of inflation, and the second is health.

The health costs under our present system are excessive. The medicare and medicaid programs are not meeting the needs of the people. This is a very severe problem.

The people are confronted with reams of paperwork. The excess of administrative costs can be eliminated through a restructuring of the entire medicare and medicaid system, and if it is agreeable with you, I have prepared a paper I would like to enter into the hearing today.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

Mr. **Roybal.** Thank you very much.

Your comments and the paper that you have submitted will become part of the record at this point.

[The information follows:]

My name- Frank R. Dwyer, 1158 Via Mavis, Santa Maria, CA. 93455
Delegate to WHCoA, active in Area Agency on Aging, A.A.R.P.,
Hospital and Conv. Home visitation, etc.

The Conference was conducted in an orderly manner, according to Roberts Rules of Order. Possibly, due to the shortness of time, some resolutions submitted were not discussed or voted upon by the Committee.

I sumbitted two Resolutions that were not discussed or voted upon. I spoke to the content of the Resolutions but the Chairman called me on the 'time' stating I overspoke my two minutes before I presented the Resolution. The Resolutions I submitted were not considered. Resolution # 162, page 13 of the Committee Recommendations is the nearest in content. Exhibit # 1 is the material I was presenting when I was called on time by the Chairman.

Basicly, the issue is the inadequacy of the payments of Medicare, Part 'B' and Medicaid. Exhibit #2, a medical statement of $35. and Medicare paid $8.80. Also, I know of a widow who required a Pacemaker implant with $10,000. medical expense and Medicare paid $4,000.

Medicare does not pay Long Term Care and it is impossible to purchase insurance coverage to pay 'custodial care', thereby makeing many destitute widows or widowers due to life savings and a home being used to pay for LTC for a spouse.
Also, the present system is requiring married couples to divorce the spouse who is in LTC so Medicaid(Medical) will pay the necessary expenses and the spouse can continue working to support children.

It is accepted that Medicare, Part B, pays about 38% of Medical expense and Part A pays an average of 73% of Hospital costs. Many doctors refuse to care for Medicaid(mediCal) patients.

Adminstrative costs for the programs are excessive.
Research thru Legislators, Governmental agencies, etc. does not reveal the Adminstrative Costs, reference Exhibit #3. shows Information is not availble to the 'Select Committee on Aging'.

Unofficially, 50¢ out of every dollar allocated for Medicare, Part B, goes for Adminstrative expense, leaving 50¢ for the Doctor who must pay an estimated 15¢ for Malpratice Liability Insurance, plus office operation, etc., so how much actually goes for the Doctor?

Presently, the British Columbia, Canada, system operates on 4% Adminstrative Cost, providing 96¢ out of every dollar for the medical cost.* The patient has freedom of choice of doctors, cradle to grave medical care, prompt payment to the providers, (30 days) and this system is now in House Resolution #1114 [illegible] which is tied up in a sub-committee of the Select Committee on Aging.

The overall cost of Medical expense in B.C. is 6.2% of the Gross National Product, whereas in the United States, the Medical Cost is 9.7% of the GNP. Current excessive adminstrative costs by deductibles, co-insurance, Reasonable or Customary Fee schedules, the time delay in setting of new Fee Schedules (2 years), delayed payment to the providers and the recipients, contribute to the excessive costs and lack of payments to the recipients.

Exhibits # 4 & 5 include the Resolutions I submitt to restructure the Medicare and Medicaid Systems.

* Exhibit 3A

Ladies and Gentlemen:

My statement will be direct. However, I speak for the individual person's needs.

First the problem, the individual receives too small a percentage of the dollar allocated to the present Health Care Programs. Administrative costs, insurance, etc., of Medicare Part B are approximately 50% leaving 50¢ or less, out of the dollar for actual medical expense.

The payment under Medicare Part B is woefully inadequate. Medical statement and supporting evidence is available to show a $35. medical bill the amount approved by Medicare is $11. 80% payment = $8.80. Also, most physicians refuse to accept payment according to the Medicaid schedule. Yet, as a nation we are paying out 9.7% of our Gross National Product for Health Care. The Canadian British Columbia Health Plan, covering 99% of the population cost is only 6.2% of the GNP, 56% less than U.S. The Administration costs of the U.S. Plans are excessive. Let us get to the root of the problem - excessive bureaucy expenses. We need a Comprehensive Health Plan that returns 96¢ out of every dollar, similar to the B.C. Plan. Our Congressmen recognize the problem. Reference two Bills, Senator Metzenbaum, Ohio, S-1566 and Congressman Lagomarsino, House Resolution 1114 deal effectively with the problem, but, we have not given the necessary support.

Whereas, Medicare Part A pays less that 73% of Hospital services, Part B pays less that 40% of Medical Services; because of excessive Administrative costs. The recipients of Part B are overwhelmed by the need to complete numerous claim forms and have limited recourse for adjustment or correction of errors.

The Health Care Services are costing 9.7% of our Gross Nations Product, versus 6.2% of GNP in B.C. where a superior plan exists. Medicare and Medicaid recipients are not receiving proper and/or adequate medical care.

Long Term custodial care is excluded by Medicare.

THE Solution-

Therefore, let it be resolved,

#1 That the present Medicare and Medicaid systems by replaced with a Comprehensive National Health care plan for all persons presently qualifying for Medicare and/or Medicaid thru better utilization of the money presently allocated to these programs.

EXHIBIT #1

#2 A cost effective delivery system be implemented with a cap of 15% for all administrative costs thereby requiring a minimum of 85¢ of every dollar allocated to the program to be paid for actual Medical expense. Presently, the B.C. system is returning 96¢ of each dollar.

#3 Eliminate all co-insurance, deductibles and reasonable fee schedules by use of a review board, setting fees on a quarterly basis, computerize the physicians and hospital billing procedure, thereby reducing waste thru the present bureaucratic system.

#4 Provide "In Home" care services at the direction of the individuals physician to enable prolonged independent living.

#5 The Plan should provide custodial care when institutional care is required.

#6 The private sector should be permitted to compete for the administration of the Plan with limited governmental safeguards.

Occidental Life
A Transamerica Company

Explanation of Medicare Benefits

Occidental Life Insurance Company of California

THIS IS YOU[illegible]
CHECK DETAC[illegible]
ON DOTTED LIN[illegible]

[illegible]ORTANT: KEEP THIS NOTICE
[illegible] FUTURE REFERENCE.

[illegible]S IS NOT A BILL: THIS IS
[illegible]ATEMENT OF THE ACTION
[illegible]EN ON MEDICARE CLAIMS
[illegible]TLED IN YOUR BEHALF.

BENEFICIARY OR REPRESENTATIVE

FRANK K [illegible]
1130 VIA [illegible]
SANTA MARIA CA 93455

YOUR MEDICARE NUMBER (HEALTH INSURANCE CLAIM NUMBER)

[illegible]

ALWAYS USE THIS NUMBER WHEN WRITING ABOUT YOUR CLAIM.

1 SERVICES WERE PROVIDED BY	PROVIDER ID	2. SERVICE DATES FROM MO · DAY	TO DAY · YR	SERVICE SEE BACK PLACE	TYPE	NO.	3 AMOUNT BILLED	4 AMOUNT APPROVED BY MEDICARE	5. YR/AMOUNT APPLIED TO DEDUCTIBLE	6 80% OF BALANCE	7 AMOUNT PAYABLE AT 100%	8 NET AMOU[illegible] PAID [illegible] MEDICA[illegible]
[illegible]	627970	07-23	23-80	1	E	1	35.00	11.00	1980	SEE NOTE	0 BELOW.*	
[illegible]	911	[illegible]	[illegible]				35.00	11.00	0.00	8.80	0.00	8.

[illegible] OF MEDICARE DOES NOT PAY FOR THIS FULL CHARGE. SEE ITEM 3 ON BACK.

THIS IS NOT A BILL

EXHIBIT #2

[illegible]HECK [illegible]ATE	CHECK NUMBER		NUMBER OF CLAIMS	AMOUNT BILLED	AMOUNT APPROVED	AMOUNT DEDUCTIBLE	80% OF BALANCE	AMT PAYABLE AT 100%	MEDIC[illegible] PAYM[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	CHECK TOTAL ▶	1	35.00	11.00	0.00	8.9[illegible]	0.00	[illegible]

[illegible] OF THE $60.00 ANNUAL DEDUCTIBLE FOR 1980 HAS BEEN MET BY FRANK K [illegible]

[illegible]RE TO READ THE IMPORTANT INFORMATION ON THE BACK OF [illegible]

USE THE ENCLOSED "REQUEST FOR PAYMENT" THE NEXT TIME YOU WISH TO CLAIM MEDICARE BENEFITS. [illegible]

SUMMARY - H.R. 1114 NATIONAL VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE ACT OF 1981 - LAGOMARSINO

This Act would provide total coverage of all necessary medical and hospital care, without limits, exclusions or deductibles, for all Americans at about the same cost to the government as the present and projected cost of Medicare and Medicaid, which would be eliminated.

The total $90 billion budget for the universal health insurance program in 1980 is to provide $10 billion more than all expenditures on medical and hospital care in 1977, and would be shared equally between subscribers' premiums and U.S. Treasury general funds. Premiums would range from a maximum of $25 a month for adults and $12.50 a month for children down to a minimum of $3 for adults and $1.50 for children, depending on family income, averaging about $17.50 a month per person or a total of $45 billion a year for 215 million Americans. The government's matching share of the cost, $45 billion, would be about the same as the projected cost of Medicare and Medicaid in 1980.

Enrollment and participation in the Insurance plan both by subscribers and doctors would be voluntary. Any compulsory system would entail much higher administrative costs for collection and enforcement and also result in an increased demand for unnecessary medical services which would eventually lead to direct government intervention in the delivery of health care.

Employers could pay all or part of their employees' premiums and local governments could "buy in" to the plan at the lowest premium levels for welfare recipients. Enrollees would choose their own doctors or could elect to receive all of their health care from a Health Maintenance Organization (HMO).

In effect, the plan calls for a negotiated annual contract between the government and the medical profession under which the government's role would be strictly limited to paying the bills and the doctors would have sole responsibility for policing the system within a total budget. If the doctors failed to control the cost of medical and hospital services and the outflow of payments exceeded the inflow of premiums and matching funds, all participating doctors would have to accept reduced fees. The projected budget for 1980 allows a total of $31.5 billion for medical expenses, an average of $90,000 a year for each of 350,000 physicians. In addition, operation of the program would reduce the average doctor's present office expenses for bill collecting and insurance by at least $15,000 a year.

The program would provide the most practical and effective means of stopping the present rapid inflation in hospital costs, by greatly reducing administrative, collection and malpractice insurance costs and by requiring prior approval for all future hospital expansion. The plan would require hospitals to include all services and supplies within a single basic per diem rate for each patient, based on a firm budget and actual total operating costs.

All enrollees and providers would be required to agree to preliminary arbitration of all malpractice claims, which would substantially reduce the present cost of malpractice litigation, settlements and insurance (which adds at least 15% to the cost of all health care) particularly since patients would no longer receive the bills for unsatisfactory treatment which now trigger most malpractice suits.

Administrative costs of the program would be legally limited to 3% of total funds and the plan would be prohibited from issuing any rules or regulations other than those contained in subscribers' and providers' contracts.

By absorbing Medicare and transferring the cost-sharing burden to Treasury general funds, the program would relieve the growing pressure on the Social Security system and substitute a more progressive form of taxation for part of the regressive Social Security taxes.

Operation of the National Voluntary Health Insurance Act can be predicted with some degree of assurance because it is largely based on the 30 years of experience and proven principles of the British Columbia hospital and medical insurance programs, the most successful of the 10 different provincial health plans in Canada.

EXHIBIT #3A

	British Columbia MEDICAL Services Insurance Plan	1970	1972	1974	1976	1978	1979/80
1	Approximate total enrollment (99% of population)	1,920,000	2,260,000	2,430,000	2,489,000	2,512,000	2,550,000
2	Average per capita MONTHLY premium (premiums vary according to	$ 2.95	2.86	2.92	3.20	4.85	5.90
3	Average per capita ANNUAL premium (age, family & income)	$ 35.40	34.34	35.00	38.50	58.24	70.60
4	Total annual PREMIUM INCOME	$ 67,904,845	77,623,001	84,989,930	95,851,008	146,287,327	148,424,227
5	Federal/Provincial subsidization	$ 36,116,023	60,024,329	70,696,637	174,755,002	177,041,625	214,381,102
5a	Federal assistance expressed as a Per Capita subsidy (5. ÷ 1)	(18.81)	(26.55)	(29.09)	(70.21)	(70.48)	
6	B.C. Govt. premium subsidies (social)	$ 17,306,825	17,410,680	19,279,047	23,630,374	29,912,948	31,531,322
6a	Item 6 expressed as Per Capita subsidy (line 6 ÷ line 1)	(9.01)	(7.70)	(7.93)	(9.49)	(11.91)	
7	Interest earned on premium deposits	$ 1,729,674	1,999,293	3,977,684	1,791,946	169,915	150,332
8	Total Plan income from all sources (line 4 + 5 + 6 + 7)	$123,057,367	156,605,894	178,517,650	296,028,330	353,416,815	394,986,983
9	Average gross income per Enrollee (line 8 ÷ line 1)	$ 64.09	69.29	73.46	118.93	140.69	154.90
10	Total payments for MEDICAL SERVICES benefits	$106,942,396	132,459,901	178,517,650	256,933,126	316,652,452	356,928,397
11	Average MEDICAL benefits for each Enrollee (line 10 ÷ line 1)	$ 55.69	58.61	66.97	103.23	126.06	140.00
12	Total number of FEE-FOR-SERVICE claims paid	14,500,000	16,140,000	18,540,000	23,380,000	24,252,808	N/A
13	Average number of claims per enrollee (12 ÷ 1)	7.5	7.1	7.6	9.3	9.6	
14	Average fee paid per claim (10 ÷ 12)	$ 7.37	8.21	8.77	10.99	11.97	
15	Approx. number of fee-for-service & salaried MDs	2,350	2,850	3,160	3,600	3,900	4,000
16	Ratio of MDs to Enrollees in Plan (line 1 ÷ line 15)	1 : 817	1 : 790	1 : 769	1 : 691	1 : 644	1:640
17	Average number of fee claims per MD (line 12 ÷ line 15)	6,170	5,663	5,867	6,494	6,218	N/A
18	Average fees paid to each MD (including billings under $20,000)	$ 45,500	46,500	51,500	71,370	81,193	90,000
19	NON-MEDICAL benefits paid (chiropractic, Christ.Science, etc.)	$ 6,775,455	5,563,924	8,693,565	14,749,530	17,436,161	21,132,210
20	Total ADMINISTRATIVE expenses (claims,collections,salaries,etc)	$ 5,687,035	6,567,847	8,581,794	12,659,521	13,207,188	16,856,376 ←*
21	Administrative expenses expressed as % of income	4.6%	4.1%	4.8%	5.2%	3.74%	4.27%
22	Average administrative cost per claim (line 20 ÷ line 12)	$ 35¢	41¢	46¢	54¢	54¢	N/A
	British Columbia HOSPITAL Services Insurance Plan						
23	Payments to Hospitals, building grants & administrative costs	$158,901,010	208,067,349	277,302,574	486,663,956	594,828,155	631,382,771
24	Average per capita cost (line 23 ÷ line 1)	$ 82.76	92.06	114.11	196.00	236.79	246.00
25	Total days-in-hospital for acute & rehabilitative care	3,465,504	3,543,587	3,449,166	3,544,283	3,617,500	
26	Number of patients hospitalized (acute & rehab. care)	369,210	388,747	398,529	425,933	427,350	
27	Average length of stay, acute & rehab. care (line 25 ÷ line 26)	9.4	9.1	8.6	8.3	8.4	
28	Average days-in-hospital per capita (line 25 ÷ line 1)	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.4	
29	Total days of extended-care hospitalization	531,808	817,321	1,187,000	1,497,312	1,896,275	
30	Total number of extended-care patients	1,022	1,822	2,475	3,696	3,897	
31	Average length of stay for extended care (line 29 ÷ line 30)	520	449	480	405	486	
32	Average days per capita of extended care (line 29 ÷ line 1)	.28	.36	.49	.60	.75	
33	Total out-patient clinic, emergency room & day-surgery visits	235,000	453,589	985,300	1,285,200	1,390,000	
34	Average per capita out-patient visits (line 33 ÷ line 1)	.12	.20	.40	.52	.55	
35	Total administrative cost (incldg. construction planning)	$ 1,135,918	1,400,095	1,800,230	3,556,066	3,856,217	4,237,159
36	Administrative expense as % of total budget (line 23 ÷ line 35)	.71%	.67%	.44%	.69%	.65%	.67%
37	Combined average administrative cost of MEDICAL & HOSPITAL Insurance Plans as % of combined total budgets	2.41%	2.18%	2.27%	2.07%	1.8%	2.06%
38	**PER CAPITA COST *all* Medical/Hospital care**	$ 146.85	161.55	187.67	314.93	377.48	402.50

PREPARED BY: Peter Fisher
Santa Barbara, California

SOURCES: British Columbia Dept. of Health
& British Columbia Medical Association

BRITISH COLUMBIA MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICES INSURANCE PLANS

Operating experience for 10 *years: 1969/70 through* 1979/80

In 1976, the total cost of health care in the U. S. was $140 billion or $651 *per capita* of which $254 *per capita* paid for hospital service and $121 paid for medical care. In British Columbia, the total cost of all health care was $892 million or $357 *per capita* of which $196 paid for hospital service and $103 paid for medical care. Yet British Columbia residents averaged 50% *more* hospitalization than Americans (1.5 days-in-hospital *per capita* compared to 1-day) and were attended by more private fee-for-service doctors (1 for each 691 residents compared to 1 for each 725 Americans.) Although the average gross fees earned by the B. C. doctors was less than their American colleagues ($71,000 compared to $85,000), their net income was more because they had about $20,000 less expenses in collecting their fees and paying for malpractice insurance.

Hospitals cost more to build and operate in B.C. than in the U.S. but the insurance program effectively restrains hospital expansion and duplication, resulting in a 90%+ bed utilization rate compared to barely 50% in the U.S. Like their doctors, B.C. hospitals also have virtually no cost in collecting their bills from the insurance program.

The most important single economy in the B.C. health insurance system is its extremely low administrative cost, as shown on the bottom line of ths table below. In 1976, administrative expenses were 2.07% of the amounts actually paid for medical and hospital services, or about $7 *per capita*. In the U.S., the total sales and administrative costs of all public and private insurance programs (which pay for less than 70% of health care) exceed 15% of our total health bill or about $100 *per capita*. As stated above, the low administrative costs of the B.C. system are reflected in the minimal paperwork and collection costs of the doctors and hospitals. In the U.S., our excessive insurance administrative costs impose a heavy burden of paperwork and collection expense on doctors and hospitals, thereby compounding the cost of delivering health care in this country.

The British Columbia HOSPITAL insurance program began in 1949 and covers all acute, rehabilitative and extended care as well as out-patient, day-surgery & emergency care and home & hospital renal dialysis. Patients paid only $1 per day while in hospital until 1976 when the charge was increased to $4 a day for adults. The program also pays for planning, construction & management advice in addition to 60% of capital costs of community-owned hospitals. The province paid 100% of the program cost until 1958 when the federal government of Canada began sharing costs.

The B.C. MEDICAL Insurance Plan was introduced in 1969 and is separate from the HOSPITAL program. Enrollment is voluntary and the personal responsibility of the residents. Monthly premiums were increased 50% in 1976 and now range from 75¢ individual ($1.87 per family) to $7.50 individual ($18.75 per family) depending on income. The Plan pays for all necessary medical service, in or out of hospital, with no limits, exclusions, deductibles or copayments. The fee-for-service physicians are responsible for controlling utilization of benefits by all doctors and patients through retrospective review of each doctor's total billings over a period of time rather than on a claim-by-claim basis. This system eliminates most of the paperwork and delay involved with all public and private insurance plans in the U.S. The Plan also pays for many non-medical benefits such as chiropractic, naturopathy, Christ.Science healing, drugs, physiotherapy, eyeglasses, etc., on a limited annual basis.

The other 9 provinces of Canada also have medical and hospital insurance Plans financially assisted by the federal government but each is somewhat different to the others. On the basis of annual reports, the B.C. Plans appear to deliver the most health care at the lowest cost and the least strain on the provincial budget. In 1978, the B.C. government will begin a new $250 million home-care and homemaker services program to round-out what is stated to be the most comprehensive health care program in the world.

NOTE: The Medical Services Insurance Plan experienced a substantial increase in ADMINISTRAT. expense in 1979/80 due to an agreement with the Medical Association to pay doctors' billing claim twice per month instead monthly, thus doubling processing costs. (See Line 21)

***Note:** By 1978, there were almost twice as many hospital staff & visiting nurses in B.C. per capita (1:100 population) and nurses' salaries averaged about 50% higher than in the U.S.*

Format for Recommendation

Committee on HEALTH CARE & SERVICES

PROPOSAL # ________

Offered by: FRANK R. DWYER

Delegate from CALIFORNIA

(and cosponsored by Delegates listed on reverse)

Relating to (if recommendation is an amendment)

Page______ line______

Be it resolved that:

~~I make a motion that~~ the present MEDICARE AND MEDICADE systems be replaced with a Comprehensive National Health Care plan for persons presently qualifying for Medicare and/or Medicade through better utilization of the money presently allocated to these programs; that a cost effective delivery system be implemented with a cap of 15% for all administrative costs thereby requiring a minimum of 85¢ of every dollar allocated to the program to be paid for actual Medical Expense; that all co-insurance, deductibles and "resonable fee schedules" be eliminated by use of a review board for setting fee schedules on a quarterly basis; computerize the physicians and hospital billing procedure, thereby reducing waste caused by the current system; that "In-home"care services be provided at the direction of the individuals physician to enable prolonged independent living; that the plan provide custodial care when institutional care is required and that the private sector should be permitted to compete for the administration of the plan with limited governmental safeguards.

Recommendations for Implementation:

Congressional Action

House Resolution #1114 LAGOMARSINO (LONG TERM)

SENATE S 1566 METZENBAUM (SHORT TERM)

EXHIBIT #4

the White House Conference on Aging

(attach additional sheets as necessary)

Format for Recommendation

Committee on HEALTH CARE AND SERVICES

PROPOSAL #

Offered by: FRANK R. DWYER

Delegate from CALIFORNIA

(and cosponsored by Delegates listed on reverse)

Relating to (if recommendation is an amendment)

Page____ line____

Be it resolved that: THE MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SYSTEMS SHOULD BE RESTRUCTURED TO BETTER UTILIZE THE MONIES NOW ALLOCATED TO THESE PROGRAMS THRU DEVELOPMENT OF A MORE COST EFFECTIVE DELIVERY SYSTEM.

Recommendations for Implementation:

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION AND BY DIRECTION FROM THE SECRETARY OF H.H.S. TO REDUCE PAPER WORK BY USE OF ELECTRONIC PROCESSING EQUIPMENT. ELIMINATE "REASONABLE FEE" PROCESS BY REGIONAL FEE SCHEDULE PROCESS. MORE PROMPT PAYMENT TO PROVIDERS AND RECIPIENTS BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY.

EXHIBIT #5

non germane for R.M.

the White House Conference on Aging

(attach additional sheets as necessary)

PROPOSAL #__________

COSPONSORS

	Please print last name	From (State)	Delegate's Signature
Delegate	Clay Cox		Nebraska
Delegate			
Delegate			
Delegate			
	Robert Fenlon	Cal	R Keith Fenlon
	Frank Buce	OK	WS Buce
	Fred Hein	Ill	F V Hein
	JUANITA BARTLET	CALIF	Juanita Bartlet
	Hope Ross	Okla	
	James F Conover	IND	JAMES F. CONOVE.
	MAX TAGLIN	Wis	Max Taglin
	RG Wardrop	Pa	Clifford B. [illegible] M.D RG Wardrop

STATEMENT OF ENRIQUE GARCIA

Mr. **Garcia**. Good afternoon. I am Enrique Garcia. I was appointed to the White House Conference by Governor Brown. Based on the miniconferences that we had not only in Los Angeles County, but also in the State, and the needs of the seniors themselves expressed to us, this is the kind of presentation that I not only presented at Washington, but what I am doing right now—I have been invited six times to make presentations of what to place in Washington—in North San Fernando, Hollywood, San Diego, and I am being invited in two meetings.

Basically we have a responsibility not only to represent our seniors to their needs, not on what we think, but also to let them know what happened and follow through.

This is what I am doing.

I think it is very important that our responsibility not end with the Conference but to follow through.

Believe me, the seniors spoke there, and I have hope for the future. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ROSE KIRKHAM

Ms. **Kirkham**. My name is Rose Kirkham, member of the National Association of Parliamentarians.

I watched the Congress in Washington on TV and I listened to the delegates today. It is obvious to me that the national officers of this society do not have any bylaws at all. It seems to me that they should have some. It would take a year's study. They should go to the National Association of Parliamentarians in Washington, D.C., and get a professional parliamentarian to meet with the delegates and form bylaws and voting rules and agenda, and then before they have this meeting, 6 months before, the delegates should read these bylaws and before the association votes, read the rules from the bylaws on how to vote, so you know the ballots were counted correctly, which obviously they were not.

The parliamentarian should be sitting there with the national president advising them, and if they had some rules to go by—this is not an unusual thing. I imagine the first Congress that met to make the Constitution—Thomas Jefferson saw this and brought the rules before the Congress. The House of Representatives has a parliamentarian in Washington who could help advise.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT STOTELMEYER

Mr. **Stotelmeyer**. I am Robert Stotelmeyer.

I would like everybody to know I am very honored to be a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging and associate with so many intelligent and well-informed people. It has been a real learning experience for me.

I turned in an item I would like to be part of the record from the private sector that was not admitted due to the chairman not letting it in.

I would like to make that part of the record.

The reason I got interested in the White House Conference is because of the plight of the people in the San Pedro Valley that live in mobile homes by themselves, with no relatives and nobody to take care of them. That was my main idea. I hope something good comes out of this conference for those particular people.

Mr. **Roybal.** Thank you.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE HAMILTON

Mr. **Hamilton.** I am George Hamilton, appointed by Governor Brown to the White House Conference.

I was proud to be appointed to the White House Conference. Since 1951, when the first White House Conference convened, much has been accomplished.

As regards to the elderly, and speaking for myself, in behalf of the other retirees, since internal vigilance is the price of freedom, it is incumbent to each of us to hang in there and keep fighting. Thank you.

Mr. **Roybal.** Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF LUPE MORALES

Ms. **Morales.** I am Lupe Morales.

Everything has been said, the negative and the positive. I could say a lot more. I was one of the delegates dismissed from the original chairmanship of the White House Conference on Aging. Also one of the committees which was quality of life. My concern is this.

In the beginning of the White House Conference on Aging, it was expressed over and over again to refer to the problems also of the minorities, which issue was taken away from the format on the White House Conference on Aging.

I hope in the future conferences this issue will come, because the United States is a melting pot of all nationalities. So I want this stressed when we come and talk about it in the next Conference on Aging.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF CRUZ SANDOVAL, ANAHEIM, CALIF.

Mr. **Sandoval.** I am Cruz Sandoval from Anaheim, appointed by your colleague, Bill Dannemeyer. It has been a great experience for me to get involved in aging, the fact that I now am one. I can remember when this phase of life did not concern me too much. I was making my living and busy doing so. Now I find the concerns of the aging—I have been involved in the community forever, it seems, but now I have got to get involved in some other way and in fact it is with the aging I am now very concerned.

I am passing the word to places in our community that I am available. I spoke at some gatherings in the community. I will be speaking at Saddleback College later on this month. Also at the University of Fullerton, and I will never turn an invitation down. I am promoting aging, and to be concerned with aging. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF IRENE BEAM, EAGLE ROCK, CALIF.

Ms. **Beam.** I am Irene Beam. I am from Eagle Rock. I am a volunteer in the senior citizens program there.

I hear many of the complaints of the elderly. I heard on television the other day they are going to try to make cuts now in the convalescent hospitals.

It will be very sad indeed. We have one man where I am volunteering who had to sell his home and his car to pay his wife's hospital bills because she had not quite made it as a senior citizen.

I am sure Congressman Roybal, who has all our best interests at heart—and we are very fortunate in having him—is aware of all these problems.

A member of my family was admitted to a hospital at 1 o'clock in the morning, went out the next day at 11:30, and the bill was $1,167.55 and that did not include the ambulance.

I am sure you are aware of all the cuts being made and all the things that need to be taken care of, and I am thankful we have you in Washington.

Mr. Roybal. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think you will agree this has been a worthwhile hearing. We have heard from both sides. We hope to continue this hearing in northern California, take it to other States, and then have also a similar hearing in Washington, D.C.

When this series of hearings is finally completed, we will make certain recommendations; that is, the committee as a whole.

I hope that we will be able to get, particularly to each and every one of you who has testified, a copy of the recommendations that will be made.

I hope we can also send a copy of the recommendations to every senior citizen organization, at least in the State of California.

We will do everything we possibly can to keep you informed.

May I thank several people for their participation?

I thank first of all those who testified, those who made a contribution.

I would also like to thank Miss Anna Edgecomb, who is the president, and Sara McClure, the vice president of the Thursday Senior Club which, incidentally, prepared the coffee and doughnuts for today. I hope you will agree with me that the coffee and doughnuts of today were a lot better than the buffet dinner at the conference.

I again want to thank Mr. Pete Cotti and Mr. Ray Servens, the custodians in this facility, who have been most helpful in working with our committee, setting up the room, and making the facility available.

May I thank also Jack Perez, from the Department of Parks and Recreation, who helped in the preparation, because, without their cooperation, we could not have had such a hearing.

May I also thank Miss Sheila Duffy, the young woman that is a gerontologist by training, very much interested in the problems of the senior citizen.

And I bring this to the attention of those who are here because I firmly believe that the problems of aging should be addressed not just by those of us who have already reached that age, but by the young, those who are starting out, because if they are lucky, they will reach age 65.

And it seems to me that they should start preparing for that time.

Miss Duffy has that preparation and I would like to thank her for the job she did in contacting the committee witnesses, and for helping out strictly on a voluntary basis.

Again, may I thank each and every one of you. The meeting is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 2:30 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[The following was received for the record:]

APPENDIX

To: Congressman Edward R. Roybal, House Select Committee on Aging, Congressional Subcommittee Hearing, January 7, 1982.
From: Morris Better, hearing witness.
Subject: Testimony given at hearing.

Congressman Roybal, durable cohorts, I appreciate the opportunity to present my testimony at this hearing and, in particular, to suggest followup action to the White House Conference in Washington last month.

I think it would be useful if I first elaborated on my introduction and further identified myself. I am a voluntarily retired university professor in the field of education. My affiliation with the Gray Panthers is in the capacity of a member of the national steering committee. I was a delegate-at-large to the White House Conference representing the Gray Panther organization. Additionally, and for 18 months preceding the WHCOA, it was my responsibility to plan and coordinate delegate involvement and organizational participation in the WHC.

It has proven to be useful for my own orderly thinking to perceive the conduct of the WHC apart from the productivity of the Conference and to assess each of the components separately—without entirely denying the relationship of the two parts. With your permission, I would like to proceed by giving you, first, my characterization of each of the components and then suggest what I deem to be appropriate followup action or implementation with respect to each.

An unmistakable air of mistrust and suspicion prevailed going into the Conference generated by a number of 11th-hour administration efforts to coopt the Conference. The catalog of these efforts has been properly detailed by preceding witnesses. This air of mistrust continued through the Conference as suspicions were realized and the attempts at manipulation were documented. The air of mistrust persists to this day with numerous questions concerning the compilation of the Conference recommendation and the fidelity of the final Conference report. What began as and should have remained an open, delegate-controlled, democratically-run, non-partisan Conference became, instead, an administration-controlled, regimented, and highly partisan Conference. Fortunately, in light of subsequent developments, the administration efforts to sanitize the Conference were crude, heavy-handed, and woefully miscalculated the willingness of the delegates to be timid and submissive.

I would like to note that, in its own militancy, the Gray Panthers moved its regularly-scheduled biennial convention from California to Washington in order to provide a presence during and to influence the conduct of the WHC. We noted that other membership organizations as well as individual delegates came to Washington in no mood to be manipulated or trivialized. It was a matter of great personal satisfaction to see so many people who were not Gray Panthers talk and act as though they were. It was abundantly clear that the 11th-hour move to control the Conference proved to be counterproductive. Instead of polite submissiveness, the delegates demonstrated justifiable indignation and anger and a suspected, but heretofore, unevidenced degree of militancy.

With respect to the recommendations and resolutions, I would characterize the productivity of the Conference as having successfully resisted encroachment upon the programs and benefits of the past decades. It was a "holding action" that translates into a major victory, given the climate of the Conference and of the economy as well. However, it is somewhat regrettable that, except for a few minor examples, no significant new ground was broken. I am inclined to attribute this to the fact that so much time was spent in confrontation that new directions affecting the welfare of our older population could not be delineated or considered. As examples, two areas that merited consideration were: (1) the improvement of intergenerational harmony and cooperation and (2) the relationship and impact of military appropriations on the quality of life of older persons and all segments of the population. Both of these areas received a fair measure of consideration in State House Conferences and the idea of an age-integrated society was the topic of seven technical papers that were prepared for the WHC.

Nevertheless, it cannot be minimized that many excellent recommendations did emerge from the deliberations and that a respectable blueprint for legislative consideration and enactment into public policy on issues affecting America's older population does now exist.

The final report of the WHCOA and the recommendations of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services is not due for several months. There are actions that, in my opinion, the Congress can realistically pursue at this time as well as after the appearance of the report. The suggestions that I would like to propose to this committee are directed, in the first instance, to the procedures and conduct of the Conference and the Conference planning and, in the second instance, to the recommendations the Conference delegates generated or failed to generate.

Because of time considerations, I would urge that the House Select Committee on Aging or its appropriate subcommittee address the matter of Conference planning and Conference control—expanding, if you will, on the task so auspiciously begun by your subcommittee. Such an expanded hearing should seek to determine and collate all evidence and allegations of impropriety, irregularities, or illegalities engaged in by administration officials in their efforts to coopt this Congressionally-authorized Conference; to disorganize the duly elected and chosen grass roots delegates; and to produce a sanitized set of recommendations that would not prove embarrassing to the administration and administration policies. Such a hearing should gather testimony on, but not limited to, the following evidence and/or allegations:

(1) The existence of delegate control or delegate services section within the WHC planning organization; that this section operated under strict security and was off-limits except to approved personnel.

(2) The careful "building" of committee membership, with initial assignments to favored or approved delegates; that these were provided early notification of their assignments while other, subsequent assignments were delayed until the last week; that there was "packing" of specific committees with high numbers of hand-picked delegates.

(3) The criteria employed in the selection of "the 400" preferred delegates; that there was an apparent disregard of the population characteristics grid so scrupulously imposed on the selection of the earlier, grass roots delegates; to determine the demographics of this group of handpicked delegates: age, gender, minority representation, affluence level, geographical representation, et cetera.

(4) The qualifications possessed by the handpicked delegates, determining what experience or acquaintance they possessed with aging issues or problems; whether and where they mesh with established aging organizations or aging concerns.

(5) The advance briefings and preparation received by these delegates; what tasks and responsibilities were assigned or delegated to them.

(6) Provisions, routine or extraordinary, for personal expenses (travel, meals, hotel, etc.) for these delegates—i.e., the extent of the taxpayer subsidy for these delegates to interfere with the legitimate purposes and intent of the Conference.

(7) The membership profiles provided each of the Committee Chairs; how these profiles and the "adversary" lists were developed; who was involved in the collection of this information and the providing of this service; how and by whom this activity was authorized.

(8) The allotment of delegates to bona-fide membership organizations that have commitment to the interests and welfare of the older population. Some of these organizations (AARP, NRTA, NCOA, NCSC, AGHE, WGS, Gray Panthers) have mass memberships numbering, in some instances, in the millions, yet a total of 75 delegate positions were assigned to some 25–30 such organizations in totality; the apparent secrecy about his allotment (number, criteria, etc.); the reservation, in context of the above, of an estimated 400 delegate positions by HHS Department and WHC Executive Director to individuals not involved or less directly involved in aging issues.

In substance: to determine in what ways and to what extent the Congressional intent of the "1981 White House Conference Act" was obstructed and emasculated.

And now, addressing the productivity of the Conference—the mass of recommendations that came out of it—I would ask that your committee, Congressman Roybal, give consideration to what seemed to be a general consensus of most of the delegates and what received approval in the single voice vote at the close of the Conference. That being, that programs presently in place continue to be funded so as to continue their operation and that services that have been provided be continued, as a minimum, at present levels. I would ask that your committee takes its cue from 2,000 or so legitimate delegates and staunchly resist any encroachment on programs and services already in place. This is a task for the present Congress. Political reality would seem to dictate that any enhancement of services requiring new legislation will fall in the purview of the next Congress. I would urge, further, that your committee provide the impetus for some followup action in each of the following specific categories:

(1) Private Sector Involvement: that no reductions be made in budgetary supports that are linked to the promise of an eventual philanthropic participation by the private sector. If the philosophy of a government-private sector partnership is to be pursued, it be done so as a partnership with defined roles and expectations for each. Interfacing of government and private sector roles and responsibilities be made gradual, continuous, and without gaps that produce hardships for those cut from needed assistance. Government support should be withdrawn only with a carefully phased-in, concurrent program of private sector assistance.

(2) Age-integrated Programs: that the merits of non-age-specific programs be given serious consideration and, to the extent possible, preference given to age-specific services. The justification for this revised emphasis be a consideration for cost effectiveness and the social objective of reducing age-stratified antagonisms.

(3) Military Appropriations: that a vigorous challenge be mounted to achieve a more equitable and more realistic military appropriation based upon (a) identification and elimination of waste, inefficiency, mismanagement, fraud, and distorted priorities within the defense establishment; and (b) an examination of the impact of military escalation on the quality of life for older persons and other segments of the population as well; and (c) the restoration of reductions in military-defense appropriations to human service programs assisting those in need of assistance: minorities, disabled, students, unemployed, the un-well, and the older population as well.

I would like to conclude with one final recommendation for followup action that, hopefully, would influence any plans for a White House Conference ten years hence or, for that matter, any future similar conference. I would hope that this is an idea whose time will come before this decade is over. What I would submit for your serious consideration is that we no longer have any White House Conference focusing, as to date, on the problem of portions of our population—such as Conferences on Aging, on Children and Youth, on Families, etc. In its stead, I would propose that major White House Conferences in the future be addressed to a specific nation-wide problem of general concern. As examples: a White House Conference on Health, a White House Conference on Poverty, a White House Conference on Housing, etc. It would be the purpose of such a Conference to provide a grass roots blueprint for dealing with the problem/issue as it impacts on all segments of our society. It should be kept in mind that even if we solved the housing/health/poverty problems for older persons, there would still be a housing/health/poverty problems for others. In contrast, if we successfully addressed and handled these problems on a broad, societal basis, we would be solving these problems for older persons in the process.

Thank you for the opportunity to put my suggestions for followup forward for you record and subsequent consideration. I hope that you and the members of the Select Committee on Aging see these as reasonable recommendations and worthy of consideration.

JANUARY 6, 1982.

Mr. HENRY LOZANO,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. LOZANO: Enclosed please find copy of the front page of a newsletter of which I am the editor, giving my evaluation of the White House Conference.

I am sorry I cannot get to the hearing Congressman Roybal is conducting January 7, 1982, and that I was unable to get this material to you sooner, but I would like to have it included in the complete recording of Mr. Roybal's hearing.

Thank you,

ESTHER COLEMAN.

Enclosure.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Was the White House Conference on Aging (WHCOA) a success or a failure? This is difficult to know. Some of the occurrences that I believe made it a failure and others a success are described below. What effect it will have on future Government policy is yet to be seen.

The Reagan administration's efforts to control the WHCOA are well known. The Conference rules, the last minute appointment of over 400 additional delegates as well as chairs of all the committees and the Republican supported "survey" of the politics of almost half the regular delegates made it possible for Reagan's point of view to be strongly presented in all 14 committees, and for 3 of the committees to be heavily stacked.

One of the arbitrarily established rules, that the delegates tried unsuccessfully to change, was that the findings of the 14 committees had to be voted on as a unit. Many of the 500 or so resolutions that came out of the 17 hours of committee deliberations were contradictory. Some were good, others reflected Reaganomics, but delegates had no opportunity to vote on specific issues or programs. No unified body of recommendations could be developed. No forward-looking program for seniors in the 1980s was projected.

How many and which of these findings will be distributed to the public remains to be seen. We do not know what the scheduled mail ballot to be sent to all delegates will consist of, how accurately it will reflect their true feelings, and what part of it will be published.

Because of these factors, the 1981 WHCOA cannot be considered a very successful gathering. In some ways, however, the WHCOA was a success. The seniors made it so!

The real significance of the Conference was in the battle the delegates put up against Reagan's efforts to control it. These were perceived long before the Conference opened, and counter-strategy was planned.

All through the WHCOA a good number of caucuses met. These were not only of State delegations but of organizations and coalitions that got together frequently, early and late, to evaluate and map strategy.

There was effective mass action. When one of the stacked committees was about to vote for the Reagan position that only present Social Security recipients should get existing benefits, a picket line of over 600 people outside the meeting room and the support of Congressman Claude Pepper brought about a compromise.

One committee voted their chair out of office and elected the vice-chair. Another voted to overrule a decision of their chair.

The strength of rank and file seniors and of coalition action was well demonstrated at the WHCOA, and it must be built on. As Maggie Kuhn of the Gray Panthers said recently of the WHCOA, "The agenda is not finished. We must finish it".

The California and other caucuses that worked so well before and during the WHCOA must continue to meet. Delegates must give reports to all the senior and other organizations they belong to or can contact. The fight to defeat Reaganism must continue. Reagan's Budget Message to Congress in January will recommend millions of dollars of additional cuts in social programs but not in the war budget. We must be prepared to put up a tremendous fight and work with others in coalition to maintain what we have. To make gains we must provide leadership which is clear and fearless.

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO,
SENIOR CITIZENS SECTION,
San Diego, Calif., January 5, 1982.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
Chairman of the Committee on Housing and Consumer Interest, House Select Committee on Aging, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. ROYBAL: Enclosed is my personal report of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging. I have the good fortune to be in a position to compare the 1981 White House Conference on Aging with the one held in 1971.

In 1971, we delegates were fortunate to be assigned to the committees of our selection. In addition, we were assigned to selected interest groups. The discussion groups did not exceed 45 or 50 persons. It is ludicrous that in 1971, I considered the size of the discussion group too large a hindrance to participate. We were also allowed the freedom of selecting our roommates.

In 1971, the California Department on Aging, then called the California Commission on Aging, had assignments and all necessary resource material available long before we left for Washington. In 1971, the Sacramento State Conference was one of involvement and stimulation.

At the 1981 White House Conference on Aging, I am not aware of anyone from San Diego who received top selection of his committee. Nor do I know of any San Diego delegates who were given the privilege of rooming with someone they knew.

At the 1981 meeting (held sectionally), prior to our going to the White House, the director of the California Department of Aging had not received necessary resource materials needed to train persons going to the White House. Consequently, instead of discussion on subject matter pertaining to the White House Conference on Aging, Mrs. Levy ingeniously offered parliamentary procedure training. It was embarrassing for her and frustrating for us.

In Washington, D.C., the White House Conference on Aging was indeed an extraordinary experience. We were assigned to sessions that seated approximately 300 persons. I was assigned to section XIV "public sectors." Logistically, the delegates were separated from the observers. The observers who had spent their own money and time were refused the privilege to speak and contribute towards the resolutions. The parliamentary procedure used in our section operated under extremely rigid regulations. The rules for operation that were a resolution could be presented only two pros speaking in favor of the resolution and two cons expressing negative feelings. It was very obvious and apparent that participation in this procedure was practically nil.

During the first session of the committees, we endured two exceedingly long speakers who took up about 80 percent of session time. The balance of the session was used in establishing rules and regulations for operation. We actually had only two working sessions. The last session dozens of resolutions were passed or declined with little or no consideration.

I realize that the major planning of the conference was done under a contract. The Mashman Corp. had absolutely no concept of working with senior citizens.

The conferees were fed like pigs at a trough. Standing in long lines for almost an hour served buffet style resulted in many seniors being physically unable to tolerate this endurance contest. Many of them purchased their food at the other hotel restaurants. My experience was, after standing in line for 1 hour and 10 minutes, I ended up with one hot dog and two little egg rolls. The cost of this meal was almost $23.

Once again it was demonstrated by the lack of knowledge of entertainment for seniors. Kitchen band after kitchen band performed "for the old folks".

Much negative reporting has already been said about election of the 14 issues as one package without benefit of voting for each issue separately.

I strongly believe that the changing of White House Conference of Aging staff three times, the continuous modification of issues, and the non-consideration of the delegates should be strongly evaluated.

Perhaps if there is a White House Conference on Aging in 1991, more consideration will be given as to who should go and how many. Also consideration should be given on the planning, logistics, schedules, and programs for White House Conference on Aging delegates.

Sincerely yours,

EVELYN HERRMANN,
Chief of Senior Services.

REDDING, CALIF.,
December 30, 1981.

Congressman GENE CHAPPIE,
1730 Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENE: This is to thank you for nominating me to the White House Conference on Aging. I believe I was an effective delegate for the seniors in your Congressional District.

I have the following request before I get into my report of the Conference. There is this really very nice lady from Tyler, Tex. Name and address—Willie Lee Glass, 2407 No. Grand, Tyler, Tex. 75702.

If you could possibly contact her Congressman and have him write her a letter of commendation it would be a message she really deserved.

Now for the report:

A lot has been written about Republican efforts to take over the Conference but not one word about the fact that there were more Democratic delegates than Republican.

In my committee No. 2 on economic well-being—which committee was the center of all controversy and demonstrations just below the riot level. It was never pointed out that Bert Seidman, a nominee from the Federal Commission on Aging (not an elected delegate by seniors) (also a category that applies to me) who is a labor leader, a Democrat and a far left liberal did his best as part of the New York delegation, to take over our committee. He was repeatedly defeated and the reason which the news media failed to refer to is real simple. The delegates were first seniors and second politicians and there is the secret of the excellent performance of the Conference. I am really proud to have been associated with so many dedicated seniors.

I went to the Conference with four measures to be introduced. My first was a change in the social security payment structure (copy attached), defeated because it was against the committee's resolution of no change in social security.

My second to raise minimum on S.S.I. recipient's funds on hand from $1,500 to $2,500 was approved.

My third amendment to Older Americans Act (copy attached) and my fourth on Funding Of Triple A's (copy attached) were judged to be outside the agenda for this committee.

Now I wish to address goals and objectives for the future.

First for 1991 White House Conference on Aging to be handled by NRTA-AARP and not by any political or bureaucratic branch; that also delegates be limited to one for each AAA and the United States of America and that there be no observers.

That the agenda be in place 18 months ahead of time and the delegates be elected 18 months ahead and that they then within 12 months review and purify the agenda.

That no Federal funds be used for the many mini-conferences that address only the problems of providers and do not in any way enhance programs for seniors. I have observed a great change in the attitudes and approaches by seniors and that a more forceful and experienced group of seniors is in the process of taking over from the old political hacks that have kept senior programs from going ahead.

That there is more than adequate funds being appropriated by the Congress to do the job provided that funds are properly used. A case in point is the millions of dollars being used to give fringe benefits to provider's employees. I can document such things as 4 week paid vacations, fictitious consultant fees, etc.

I feel that it will take the next ten years to clean up all the misuse of funds.

Now I have been severely criticized for my position that only seniors should be in the policy making area. My position was surely supported by the absolute degrading demonstration Thursday, December 3rd, led by a 24 year old Iranian from Ventura County in California and looked just like the hostage demonstrations of a year ago and there is no place among seniors for this type of demonstration.

Dear Gene, I feel this is a good run down on the senior picture as well as the White House Conference. There are many other matters to be addressed but they will have to wait.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY DOUGHTY.

Enclosures.

Delegate Doughty, California.

That all funding for AAA should follow the pattern set by CETA and Revenue Sharing by going from Washington, D.C. to county of use earmarked for seniors only.

As we are going to have more seniors but no more funds this will increase the number of dollars reaching seniors.

Delegate Doughty, California.

The language to be changed to eliminate the use of least advantaged, as this tends to give impression that this is welfare which the AOA is not supposed to be. Also most needy.

This will make it possible for AAA to solicit funds from the private sector without the tinge of welfare casting a cloud over their efforts.

REJECTED

FORMAT FOR RECOMMENDATION; COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Be it resolved, That:

To put the base back to 1950 eliminating aid to childrens education and other fringes not in original bill then. Have Congress approve the following schedule.

Any single or couple up to $499 per month in benefits not be affected and their CPI remain in effect.

If up to $599 per month no change except their CPI limits to 5 percent.

If up to $699 per month no change except No. CPI.

If up to $799 per month a cut of 5 percent.

If over $799 per month a 10 perent cut to be effected.

This puts Social Security back on track.

GREEN THUMB, INC.,
Arlington, Va., January 13, 1982.

Hon. EDWARD ROYBAL,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Aging,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I regret that I was unable to testify in person at the hearing which you conducted last week in Los Angeles, Calif.

I am, however, extremely interested and gratified that you called the hearing to review the White House Conference on Aging. I, too, am most interested in doing everything possible to make this conference productive.

In that spirit, we are submitting written testimony to be included as part of your hearing's record. If I can be of any further assistance to you or to Chairman Pepper, please call.

Sincerely,

CARL A. LARSON, *President.*

Enclosure.

STATEMENT BY CARL A. LARSON

MR. CHAIRMAN, I want to thank you for inviting Green Thumb to testify today.

Green Thumb, Inc. sponsored by the National Farmers Union, is a rural-based employment and training program, funded under title V of the Older Americans Act by the U.S. Department of Labor to employ parttime nearly 17,000 older rural Americans in 45 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Our program offers meaningful work and training in community service jobs for rural persons who are poor and at least age 55. Placement into unsubsidized private and public sector jobs is an integral part of Green Thumb's efforts as we help participants develop skills to market their years of experience and talent.

Green Thumb, now in its 16th year of operation, is one of eight national title V contractors and the only one focusing exclusively on ways to stimulate rural employment and strengthen the rural economy.

We are testifying here today because of our deep commitment to rural older persons and our involvement in the 1981 White House Conference on Aging.

Nearly 2 years ago Green Thumb was designated by the 1981 White House Conference on Aging to serve as the official covenor of six rural mini-conferences serving all 50 States and U.S. trust territories. The mini-conferences involving over 2000 "grass roots" participants were held during September, October, and November of 1980.

Our organization was selected because of our concern and experience in developing and implementing programs and services focused on the needs of poor, older, rural citizens.

Our rural mini-conference activities were conducted under the theme "Rural America: Coming of Age" to preserve their integrity and impartiality. We sought to bring individuals and organizations together, often for the first time, to focus attention only on concerns of the rural elderly. The process produced positive, if not unexpected results, as the attached report indicates.

"Rural America Coming of Age" became the framework to bring forward the concerns of rural leaders across the country who sought to make the 1981 White House Conference a success for all older persons including those from rural America.

Green Thumb continued its role as a facilitator through "Rural America: Coming of Age" as we prepared for the December conference. Contributions were raised from 21 States to defray the costs of the establishment of "Rural Centers" at the two White House Conference hotels.

Technical support, typing, Xeroxing and general assistance were provided to all delegates and observers. We also published a daily newspaper during the 3 days of the Conference to objectively highlight committees' proceedings.

Since 1978 when Congress passed and President Carter signed the law mandating a 1981 White House Conference on Aging, there was a resurgence of hope that it would refine and redirect many of our aging programs that emerged in the early and mid-1970's. "Special interest" and minority groups whose concerns had too long been given too little attention felt that the processes established for this conference were better designed to give closer examination to the unique needs of various segments of the aging population.

Over 30 topics were identified as issues through all the mini-conferences. They were, in turn, delivered in reports and recommendations to the White House Conferences on Aging staff by February 15, 1981. A great deal of planning and hard work by literally thousands of local, State and Federal leaders took place.

Subsequent to the change of administration in Washington, many changes in the procedures and processes for the 1981 Conference were made. The four regional delegate Conferences scheduled for August 1981 were abruptly cancelled. Conference changes took place at all levels, and, of course, in the top WHCOA leadership.

It was expected by all who participated in the forums, mini-conferences and technical committees that the results of each of these several undertakings would become the basis for study and analysis by delegates appointed to the 1981 Conference in Washington. In fact, what actually happened during the chaotic period of the Conference reorganization and restructuring was the delay of vital information needed by delegates to make sound decisions during their deliberations. Unfortunately, reports of the technical committees and mini-conferences were not distributed until delegates registered at the Conference, much too late to be read and utilized during the Conference.

Given the assurance of being able to vote on all of the issues, delegates were again confused by rules which permitted one vote only on the acceptance or rejection of the report of each of the 14 committees.

Then the late decision was made which assured each delegate that they would be given opportunity to vote separately on each individual resolution by mail from home following the Conference.

On December 22nd, immediately prior to the Christmas and the New year's holiday, a thick document containing 668 recommendations was mailed to each delegate requesting their written response on each of the 668 recommendations. They were instructed to respond by January 22, 1982. This date does not permit delegates the opportunity to vote on each recommendation, only to labor through a written statement for each of 668 newly named "recommendations". Further, delegates were not voting on previously proposed resolutions as they were originally told, but were being asked to "recommend" until their writing arms became exhausted. In addition, there was no offer of technical assistance. In fact, delegates were informed in a brief cover letter that required response forms did not allow enough space for responding to the 668 recommendations, only to 110. They were advised that they could reproduce the required form at their expense.

Mr. Chairman, we point up these examples not to be overly critical of well-intentioned public servants, but because we believe that much good came and can continue to come from the national interest stimulated by the 1981 White House Conference on Aging.

We join with many others in recommending to you ways in which we believe post conference activity can favorably impact upon the 1981 WHCOA.

Before offering our recommendations for post-conference action to strength delegate participation, I would like to briefly comment on the rural "resolutions" which delegates enacted in committees.

There were 39 separate resolutions which took note of the importance of considering rural issues. I'm attaching these to my testimony. As an added comment, eight resolutions focused on transportation, nine on the Older Americans Act and title V, five were concerned with housing, three with rural health, and nine with service delivery and outreach to older rural people. This was extremely gratifying to us and important to rural citizens. There was, however, one resolution on title V of the Older Americans Act which was passed in committee No. 3 but not reported. This is a concern to us and we are attaching that resolution for your information. It is this commitment to a thorough consideration of the issues that we want to see continued. We, therefore, recommend that the White House Conference:

Provide each delegate with a full and complete set of all resolutions—the preamble and the recommendations—proposed by the Conference, and establish a process by which they can vote in favor, or against each resolution by mail.

Permit the release of data which will give a demographic profile of delegates by State, so that policymakers and Congress can more fairly assess the recommendations of the delegates.

Be held accountable to Congress in reporting on the responses of the delegates to the 668 recommendation recently mailed to delegates, and insist that the WHCOA leadership establish a process by which such information will be processed, synthesized, and become part of the final report of the 1981 WHCOA. We estimate that a response by each delegate to each of the 668 recommendations could result in over 2,300,000 statements.

Extend immediately the response date to the Conference recommendations from January 22, 1982 to March 15, 1982, to allow the opportunity to mobilize a network of technical assistance and allow the extra time to delegates to complete their responses. We are requesting this in a letter to Betty Brake, executive director of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging, a copy of which is attached.

Provide a procedure by which delegates may review and approve the final report of the Conference prior to its official publication and release.

Mr. Chairman, we thank you for your concern and interest in improving the effectiveness of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging. This hearing demonstrates your belief that we can do better. Green Thumb pledges to continue to meet its responsibility and commitment to older, rural Americans and work with you to assure that the concerns of rural people are heard.

Thank you very much.

GREEN THUMB, INC.
1401 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209 (703) 276-0750
Subject Code: 1120

JAN 6 1982

Ms. Betty Brake
Executive Director
White House Conference on the Aging
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Ms. Brake:

On behalf of Green Thumb I would like to express our appreciation to you for giving several of our staff the opportunity to become intimately involved in the final preparations for the 1981 White House Conference on Aging. Because of this involvement, we were better able to appreciate the time and effort that went into making this decade's conference a success.

We are also very pleased at the number and quality of resolutions, passed by the fourteen committees of the conference, which dealt with rural issues. We think this shows an increasing appreciation for the unique problems which rural older persons face in health care, employment, transportation and in many other areas.

As a delegate to the conference, I am concerned about one issue in particular, the time in which I was given to respond to the 668 recommendations made in the 14 committees. It is my firm conviction that asking delegates to respond by January 22, 1982, is not enough time and that an extension to March 15th would be far more realistic. I base this on the fact that most delegates are just beginning to read the resolutions and do not have a staff on whom they can call for technical assistance, as I do. Further, the conference is asking each delegate to respond thoughtfully to the resolutions, not make a snap judgment. It is precisely this response that you will get if the deadline is not changed.

I recall from our mini-conferences which involved 2,000 rural participants responding to a relatively concise questionnaire, that it took a major effort to computerize their responses and then analyze the data. I hope that there is a method by which the responses to the resolutions may be

Sponsored by the National Farmers Union
A Senior Community Service Employment Program
Green Thumb is an Equal Opportunity Employer

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 249

We propose a comprehensive cost effective and accessible network which is a continuum of care from preventive (promotion of wellness) to intensive care at the community level for rural and urban elderly.

These services should include physical and mental health programs, senior centers, transportation, nutrition which includes congregate and home-bound meals, housing, mobile units for rural bound areas, respite care, hospice care, day care centers and I & R through outreach programs.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Changes in Medicare and Medicaid regulations to broaden all needed available services.
2. Continued use of Federal funds within Title III of the Older Americans Act.
3. Strengthen the bond between Federal, State and local funding sources.
4. Concerted effort to strengthen the bond between public and private sector.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 263

A concerted effort be made to develop housing opportunities for poor and minority elderly in rural areas less than 2500.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Congregate housing program (in which social services are provided as part of the housing package) needs to be converted from demonstration to permanent status.

Ensure that levels of transportation services for the elderly be increased and that special consideration be given to rural transportation needs.

President's Commission on Housing provide incentives in out of pocket expenses, assistance with insurance, maintenance, tax credits for mileage.

RURAL AMERICA: COMING OF AGE

1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 288

Whereas, lack of adequate transportation is a serious problem for many rural elderly especially the 50% with lower incomes.

And whereas, federal and statre money distribution furmulas fail to take into account the special rural problems of low population, poverty, difficult terrain, etc.

Therefore, be it resolved: That Congress authorize a Rural Transportation Administration within the Department of Transportation paralleling the Urban Mass Transportaiton Administration (UMTA).

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 290

The private sector and community agencies should work on transportation for the elderly in rural areas since--in most cases--a public mode of transportation is nonexistent.

IMPLEMENTATION:

State and Local areas

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 302

A system of rural and urban Volunteer Transportation Program is needed for needy elders.

IMPLEMENTATION:

This program can be developed by recruiting volunteer drivers with cars, who serve as escort guides to the seniors.

Funding by donations of Fraternal and Civic Organizations, as well as private citizens.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 422

The President and the Congress should declare a national goal of providing adequate, accessible and affordable transportation services for all elderly citizens especially the rural elderly. For many older people without access to an automobile or to public transportation, there is no way to get to a doctor, to a bank, to pick up medications, to shop or to attend religious services. Just as distance makes services in rural areas more costly, it also makes it more difficult to reach those who need services.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Establish a national policy on rural and urban elderly transportation with emphasis on the special problems of distance in rural areas.
2. Coordinate existing transportation systems and cooperate with various public and private sectors to remove restrictive barriers to maximum utilization of vehicles and resources.
3. State government must address the critical transportation needs of the rural elderly. Since the 1971 Conferenc, limited federal programs have provided funds to acquire vehicles and provide operational funds to transprot older persons to essential social services. States must assume responsibility to ensure that transportation is both available and accessible to the nation's rural elderly.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 455

Because the rural woman suffers most from isolation and loneliness, it is recommended that efforts be directed at establishing a rural transportation system that will bring the social, spiritual and health services to her that she so urgently needs. In addition, continued expansion and development of rural multi-purpose senior centers should be encouraged to provide these services.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE

1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 567

Whereas the rural elderly of the United States are a growing segment of the country's population, and

Whereas, the condition of rurality imposes special and unique needs and hardships upon those elderly residents, and

Whereas the definition of "rural" as currently interpreted under the Older Americans Act operates to the detriment of the rural elderly by treating them under urban standards,

Therefore, be it resolved: The Older Americans Act and federal programs affecting rural elderly shall define "rural area" as so stated in the Rural Development Act of 1972 (PL 92-419), as a population density of no more than 100 persons per square mile, and the private sector shall also use this definition, and further be it resolved: that the private sector shall consider the unique needs of the rural elderly and, in cooperation with government, shall sponsor and/or promote programs that will help fulfill these needs;

To urge the private sector to encourage the passage of a federal law (e.g., Florida Public Law 79-180) to establish a council for coordinating and developing better transportation to the elderly in the rural areas;

Private transportation system by volunteers, and retailers of all types should be given tax incentives for providing transportation or delivery of goods and services for the aging, particularly in rural areas.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Employment

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 46

We ask the President, Congress and the Labor Department to continue funding such programs as Green Thumb and other similar programs that employ the older worker.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 91

Employment opportunities of older adults be expanded by negotiating with federal and other agencies to secure more funds for employment in programs earmarked for older adults, such as Green Thumb National Farmers Union, Senior Aids, Senior Companions and Foster Grandparents.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Full funding of Title V of the Older Americans Act to be continued at least at the FY 81-82 level.

NUMBER 105

RECOMMENDATION:

The committee believes that this nation should fashion an economy and a labor market policy that is age-neutral and that efficiently, creatively, humanely, and equitably uses the skills, energies and work attitudes of older workers. Such a policy should involve implementation by both the public and private sectors. While the policy should be consistent with the economic realities of the coming decades, it should be equally consistent with the goals of equity and justice and include a vision of an American society which is age-neutral in work places as well as in our homes, our communities and institutions.

Specifically, the Committee recommends:

1. The federal government, in cooperation with state and local governments and the private sector, should immediately initiate a comprehensive review of public tax policies to eliminate barriers to employment and to encourage wider employment opportunities for older persons.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Employment

2. The Age Discrimination in Employment Act and related laws should be ammended to provide for full actuarial adjustments of private pension plans and full employer contributions for fringe benefits for persons who work beyond a pensioner's normal retirement age or beyond age 65. There should be no differential in employer benefit contributions based on age.

3. Management and labor--through collective bargaining--should support increased opportunities for flexible work arrangements such as part-time work with proportional fringe benefits, shared jobs, educational benefits to train for second careers and other accommodations which extend worklife for older workers. The Congress should amend the National Labor Relations Act to include extended worklife as a goal of collective bargaining.

4. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and other publicly supported training vocational education and manpower programs and services, including the U.S. Employment Service, should be held specifically accountable by the Congress by the year 1983 for equitable assitance to all age groups or face sanctions. At the same time the Title V (Older Americans Act as amended), Senior Community Employment Program should be supported and expanded having proven its utility and flexibility in employing the skills and energies of thousands of older citizens, especially minority and low income older persons.

5. The Federal government and the private sector promptly should undertake a major research and dissemination effort to accomplish the following objectives by 1985:

   a. Develop, test and implement a utilization strategy for age-neutral occupational performance appraisal tools and corresponding personal functional capacity measures for application to a wide range of current and expanding occupational categories.

   b. Investigate the comparative costs and productivity of various age groups in diverse jobs in the work force, including better methods of assessing the value of mature skills.

   c. Gather and synthesize facts related to the skills, experience, attitudes and productivity of middle-aged and older workers and disseminate such facts to employers and widely to the general public through the media.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Employment

6. Middle-aged and older workers should be encouraged and assisted to prepare to enter new careers, especially when unemployed or facing unemployment in declining industries or occupations. A "Second Career Sabbatical" could be financed through changes in unemployment insurance statutes and targeted to persons 45 and older; it could provide for up to a year of full-time education and re-training. Other arrangements could involve part-time work, together with unemployment insurance payments or cash advances against future pension entitlements for employed persons. To be successful, the program will require strong collective bargaining support, widespread participation by schools and colleges, and, probably, support through a government-related transitional employment program.

CONCLUSION

The Committee recognizes that the policy called for here constitues a framework within which programs can be developed that are mutually supportive of widening employment opportunities for all Americans. We believe that with appropriate fiscal, monetary and productivity conditions, the marketplace can provide nearly all the necessary jobs for those who desire to work. But we also believe that the government has an obligation to be an "employer of last resort" if that marketplace does not provide the job needed. With countless socially-valuable services to be rendered and with thousands of willing and competent workers available, these needs and resources can be brought together, the economy strengthened, and individuals with time, energy, skill, experience, and a willingness to continue to be of service can be gainfully employed. To do less is to miss a tremendous opportunity--for one and for all.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Employment

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 106

Be it resolved that:

America's population is aging rapidly. The growing older non-working population is placing sizable demands on public and private retirement income support and service systems. Considerable concern exists over the extent to which persons of working age can adequately support an older non-working population. Income inadequacy, which might be alleviated by continued employment of older persons willing and able to work is a serious problem for an increasing number of older Americans.

Opportunities that would facilitate a prolonged worklife (e.g., phased retirement, part-time employment, flexible work schedules) are insufficient to meet the apparent desire for employment on the part of workers on the threshold of retirement, retirees who wish to return to work, or homemakers seeking to enter the labor force for the first time or after a lengthy period of absence. Older persons, for example, are underrepresented in programs designed to enhance employment prospects, such as CETA and Public Service Employment programs and retraining, skill-updating, and on-the-job training projects. Negative stereotypes about ability to perform, as well as age discrimination, continue to restrict the opportunities for older persons to remain in the labor force, to change jobs, reenter the workforce, or obtain significant volunteer service activity.

In fact, the majority of older persons are physically, mentally, and emotionally capable of sustained, productive work in almost all fields of activity. The public, private and non-profit sectors, however, are frequently influenced by erroneous stereotypes. Older persons themselves also often accept these same stereotypes and are consequently discouraged from demanding greater opportunities for meaningful involvement.

If older persons are to be encouraged voluntarily to continue productive involvement on a paid, self-employed or volunteer basis, opportunities for their involvement must be expanded.

For the Federal Government

The Committee on Older Americans as a Growing National Resource urges the Federal Government to recognize its responsibility toward promoting employment opportunities for older Americans and to take the lead in developing and expanding programs that will enhance the employment prospects of this age group.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Employment

Specifically, the Committee recommends that:

1. In order to stimulate programs that promote the employ ability of older persons, to encourage greater elderl participation in jobs programs, and to facilitate th identification and creation of jobs for older person who are willing and able to work in unsubsidized employ ment, the U. S. Secretary of Labor appoint a Specia Assistant for Older and Retired Workers.

2. The U.S. State Employment Service and the State Governor establish a separate, active section for Older and Retire Workers as part of the operations of all State Employmen Offices.

3. The U.S. Department of Labor, through the U. S. Employmen Service, place a major emphasis on training, counseling, job-seeking skills, development and placement service for older Americans. Whenever possible, older person themselves should be used as trainers, counselors, skil developers, and placement officers.

4. The Administration vigorously enforce CETA legislation "o any replacement legislation" to guarantee adequate representation of older persons in CETA "type" programs and t accept part-time employment of older workers as an intricate part of such programs.

5. The U.S. Department of Labor ensure that older person are routinely and systematically involved in the administration of CETA legislation at local levels.

6. The U.S. Department of Labor should recognize and act upon the feasibility of using older persons as trainer in CETA programs, particularly those that involve the training of unemployed youth. DOL should recognize that older persons represent the greatest and most abundant resource for teaching job-related skills and introducing young people to the world of work.

RECOMMENDATION: **NUMBER** 557

The Senior Community Service Employment Program (Title V of Older Americans Act) be continued in its present form to help train and place low-income older Americans; and

That funds be provided for at least 54,000 positions.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Employment

RECOMMENDATION: **NUMBER** 225

Whereas the Older American Act established State Units on Agin and Area Agencies on Aging for the Planning, Coordination, Advocacy, and Funding Services for older people, be it resolved tha the Older Americans Act remain a separate and distinct federall funded categorical program with no change to a block grant status.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Expeditious reauthorization of OAA.
2. Increase the authorization level of OAA to meet the increasing needs of older people.
3. The creation of a continuum of services including family an community services to meet the unique needs of the aging, requires the creation of a cabinet level department of th aging in the Federal Government to coordinate the variou formal support systems and to encourage participation o and provide support to informal support systems.

RECOMMENDATION **NUMBER** 237

WHEREAS, poverty increased by more than 600,000 persons for thos 65 or older during the years 1978 to 1980, representing the sharpest increase in elderly poverty statistics in 20 years.

AND WHEREAS, the rural elderly and minority elderly disproportionately comprise a large percentage of the elderly poor.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Older Americans Act be re-authorized with the mandate that older persons with the greatest economic and social need receive preference in aging programs and that such mandate be vigorously enforced.

Service programs aimed at meeting the needs of low income elderly not lose their identity and effectiveness as a result of incorporation and inclusion in federal block grant programs.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. That the AOA through its regional offices continue to monitor provision of services to insure receipt of services by elderly with greatest economic/social need.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Employment

2. That the AOA and Social Security Administration form a jo
task force to assess feasibility of creating a single co
prehensive questionnaire handled and completed with the
assistance of personnel in local social security office
Such form would allow for determination of eligibility
a non-duplicitous fashion.

   The intent of this implementation step does not envision t
creation of a "means" test in connection with the eligibil
ty for elderly programs.

3. That AOA appoint a task force to, wherever possible, ident
fy and recommend the eradication of federal rules and reg
lations, not essential to the orderly, equitable and eff
cient administration of aging programs. The efforts of t
task force shall at all times be conducted in a fashio
consistent with the mandate that preference in aging pr
grams be targeted to those elderly with greatest economic
social need.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 357

Recognizing the continuing need for separate categorical legisl
tion to positively impact the lines of older Americans, the Old
Americans Act and its present implementing structure should
maintained and strengthened with special emphasis on those old
persons with the greatest economic or social need.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 57

We strongly recommend that the older Americans Act remain
separate and distinct federally funded categorical program with
changes by substitution of Block Grants.

IMPLEMENTATION:

That the Administration and the Congress be informed of t
resolution and continue to heed it by both.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Housing

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 213

A concerted effort be made to develop housing opportunities for poor and minority elderly in rural areas less than 2500.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Congregate housing program (in which social services are provided as part of the housing package) needs to be converted from demonstration to permanent status.

Ensure that levels of transportation services for the elderly be increased and that special consideration be given to rural transportation needs.

President's Commission on Housing provide incentives in out of pocket expenses, assistance with insurance, maintenance, tax credits for mileage.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 277

Congregate housing for the functionally impaired and the elderly be an alternative and an important component of long term care and be continued and expanded. The federal government should allow communities to tailor congregate housing construction or to convert portions of exiting federally subsidized housing to meet specific needs of the locality.

IMPLEMDNATION:

Congress should provide adequate funding to continue the congregate housing services program at the current level which is $10 million annually.

The Administration on Aging (AOA) and the Farmer's Home Administration (FHA) should expand their rural congregate housing demonstration program.

The federal government should provide the states with housing assistance and social service funds to promote the development of congregate housing for the elderly.

An adequate proportion of the funds available under any social service or housing block grant should be earmarked for the development of congregate housing for the elderly.

That all permanent and demonstration projects utilizing congregate housing alternative be established, allowing the private sector, both profit and non-profit entities, free access to apply for grants and aid in instituting such projects.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Housing

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 279

Whereas sixty percent of the nation's substandard housing is found in rural areas, and one out of four such units is occupied by an older individual, and

Whereas supportive services are fragmented or non-existent in these areas,

Be it therefore resolved:

The Housing Alternatives Committee recommends to the Congress and the Administration that regulations pertaining to federal programs for the elderly be made more flexible to accommodate the needs of the rural elderly. For example, the maximum number of elderly housing units usually funded by the Farmers' Home Administration may not exceed forty-five. Developing and providing supportive services for such small groups most likely will not be cost effective. FHA regulations should be flexible enough to permit more than one local rural communities to combine their efforts to finance, construct and administer larger housing complexes, with accompanying services, for the elderly.

Moreover, the residency requirement for HUD projects in rural areas should not be restricted to just low income persons. Elderly persons, regardless of income and resources should have the option of living in federally funded housing but they should be expected to pay according to their ability. (This provision not only assists the middle income person in securing housing but also reduces the stigma of living in federally subsidized housing.)

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 286

Since over 70% of the elderly own their own homes and many of these homes are 30 to 40 years old and need repairs and weatherization , we strongly support the continuation of the Community Development Block Grant program. This is the major program that allows local communities the opportunity to identify housing problems and provides funds for housing rehabilitation.

IMPLEMENTATION:

We recommend continuing the funding for the Community Development Block Grant program. Future appropriations should not be less than FY '82 authorization levels.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Housing

RECOMMENDATION: **NUMBER 151**

A maximum effort be made at all levels of government to ensure that all elderly homeowners and tenants, especially women, can remain in their homes, and be it further resolved that Federal and State governments should maintain and expand the development of subsidized housing at affordable costs for low and moderate income persons, especially elderly women. Further that elderly women should have a wide variety of housing alternatives to home ownership and rental housing. Including but not limited to mobile homes, shared and intergenerational housing, and domiciliary care and personal care homes.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Establish a minimum housing goal of 200,000 units per anum of publicly subsidized housing.

Any fiscal impact resulting from this recommendation and or policy shall be met by appropriate funding methods and levels as to be determined by the Congress.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

ENERGY

RECOMMENDATION: **NUMBER** 253

Government, at the federal, state and local levels, adopt a comprehensive approach to energy-related problems which will result in more readily available services for the elderly. The comprehensive approach should include a commitment to fund energy programs at fiscal 1981 levels, a commitment to include conservation components such as weatherization in all federal energy assistance programs.

RECOMMENDATION: **NUMBER** 255

Whereas it is a reality of our time that rising energy costs have joined the high costs of food, medicine, and housing as necessities of life which contribute to the economic hardship of many aging Americans. While it is clear that we must seek a solution to the growing energy crisis, we must also have immediate and practical ways to help those who have become its innocent victims.

Each year Congress enacts legislation to provide financial and other assistance to low income persons with emphasis on the elderly and infirmed. The current program as well as past efforts have been characterized by too much federal involvement in administration, overly restrictive terms mandated upon participating energy vendors, and frequent long delays in the actual assistance reaching the needy households.

Therefore be it resolved that an effective energy assistance program should include:

- It should be a separate program, permanent or of multi-year duration.
- Administration should be centralized in a single federal agency but more flexibility and authority must be granted to the individual states. The energy problems of the aging population vary from region to region across the country. The states working in concert with the local energy vendors can best develop a workable program for their region. Establishment of eligibility criteria and certification should be within the purview of the individual states.
- Eligibility should be limited to those truly needed aged persons rather than based solely on age or income.
- All vended forms of energy should be covered. This should include energy used for heating and cooling during

ENERGY

- Assistance should go directly to the energy vendor or be based on a line of credit extended to the vendor on behalf of the recipient.
- Assistance should be available to those persons who rent as well as those who own their place of residence.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 4/35

Adequate funding be allocated to the Energy Assistance Program for low income elderly to help them defray the exorbitant increase in the cost of heating their homes.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mental and Physical Health/Long Term Care

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 113

Be it resolved that this Conference recommends to the Congress and the Pres. to develop a national health policy involving federal, state, and local governments, the private sector which will cover all groups and which will guarantee all Americans full and comprehensive health services irrespective of their income, allow consumer access to information and assure national health planning and control.

IMPLEMENTATION:

To this end we recommend a joint Senate House Subcommittee on Health and Aging to hold and open hearings in every area in the country in preparation for the necessary enabling legislation.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 124

The financial resources of local, state, government and insurances be so designed that family members be paid a wage for caring for elderly loved ones, if they desire to keep them at home.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The funding sources should be the same as those presently used for outsiders. The only change is the funding of a family member instead of an outside caretaker.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 553

The one great need of the elderly in rural areas is homemakers and home health care service. The homemaker will supplement the now existing homemaker service provided by Social Security and a van staffed and equipped to travel over one or more counties stopping at senior citizen centers, rest homes, and low income housing to provide minor tests such as blood pressure, urine, glaucoma, and similar tests, thus permitting the elderly to stay in their own homes which they prefer and save the huge sums being paid for nursing home care after they are forced out of their own humble homes.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Social Service Delivery and Outreach/Older Americans As A Growing National Res:

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 104

Whereas, there are well over 10 million persons between the age of 55 and 60 who are in need of meaningful things to do in volunteering in community service in organized programs such as th Retired Senior Volunteer Program, and

Whereas, these potential volunteers are presently barred from participation in the RSVP program because they do not meet the minium age qualification of 60 years, the age limit for qualification in this program should be dropped to 55, and

Whereas, the present RSVP program is focused primarily on urban participation, with consequential minimum budgets for transportation during this period of $1.40 to $1.50 per gallon gasoline prices, the transportation budgets should be increased by ACTION to permit the expansion of the RSVP to rural areas and to provide more such funds for the 55-60 group, hopefully to be added and

Therefore, be it resolved that curtailment and abolishment of so many public service programs necessitate the further encouragement of volunteerism to carry on community service programs on a supervised basis, ACTION, with an organization already in place, should be given the direction to expand its present projects and to enlarge their areas of recruitment to surrounding rural areas and to accept those persons who may apply, and be provided with the funds for fully compensating its volunteers for services provided by them with their personal automobiles now and in the future.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Congress and Federal Government.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Social Service Delivery and Outreach/Older Americans As A Growing National Resourc

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 437

As our society is aging, it is also experiencing other profound changes affecting all ages as a result of the technology explosion and urbanization. These and other societal changes have extraordinary implications for educational institutions at all levels, professional associations and scientific societies. It seems likely that multiple programs will be much more commonplace -- indeed essential -- in the immediate future. Therefore, we urge eucational institutions at every level and educational organization (such as, but not limited to, the American Council on Education, Association of American Universities, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and the American Library Associatin) to give high priority to the development and implementation of programs to educate and train on an on-going basis senior adults, personnel serving the elderly, and the general public. There shall be equal access to all educational programs by older persons in such areas as admissions, financial aid, course content and location, teaching methods and training opportunities that presently serve to exclude or minimize the participatin of older adults. In order to adjust for current age discrimination, a significant percentage of scholarship aid should be allocated to older adults preparing for second careers on the basis of need and potentials. We urge colleges, universities and other appropriate institutions to pay attention to the special eucational needs of specific groups, such as, but not limited to, the rural elderly, older women, ethnic and racial groups, and the handicapped elderly. Knowledge about aging should be included in teacher preparation programs, in curricula for students at all age levels, and in training for any personnel who will be delivering services to older persons. Inasmuch as the education and training of senior adults is currently an adjunct, irregular and unstable function, the Committee urges that education and training for later life be established in the 1980's as a regular, fully-funded and prioritv function of educational institutins.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE

1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Social and Spiritual Well-Being

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 465

Whereas the rural elderly of the United States are a growing segment of the country's population, and

Whereas the condition of rurality imposes special and unique needs and hardships upon those elderly residents, and

Whereas the term rural and definition thereof remain unclear, and

Whereas the definition of "rural" as currently interpreted under the Older Americans Act operates to the detriment of the rural elderly by treating them under urban standards,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Older Americans Act and federal programs affecting rural elderly shall define "rural area" as so stated in the Rural Development Act of 1972 (PL 92-419), as a population density of no more than 100 persons per square mile, and

Further be it resolved that Federal funding formulas shall be developed to reflect local conditions of senior service delivery in rural areas.

RECOMMENDATION: NUMBER 540

The Older Americans Act and Federal programs affecting rural elderly shall define "rural area" as so stated in the Rural Development Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-419), as a population density of no more than 100 persons per square mile; and

Federal funding formulas shall be developed to reflect local conditions of senior service delivery in rural areas.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Congressional action

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE

1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Social Service Delivery and Outreach/Older Americans As A Growing National Resource

RECOMMENDATIONS: NUMBER 573

Research should be made on service delivery to the elderly on the most beneficial and economic method including the process, outcome, individual preference, ethnic and spiritual variables, and that funding be appropriated for research to study healthcare not only in institutions (hospitals and nursing homes), but also a preference given to research to care in private homes, both 24 homes a day and when utilizing adult day activity and health centers, home health services, and hospice services for part of the day, so valid conclusions may be reached concerning the effectveness of alternate services. Special priority and precedence should be given to Whole Person Health Care models (specifically holistic Health Clinics (V. of Ill. survey 78/81), Health Integration Services, Peabody, Ma, hospices, and home health services).

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. There should be an advisory council within HHS (HHS-wide) which should give advice concerning this research, with special regard to unique categories, rural, elderly, minorities, handicapped and facilitate local volunteerism senior involvement. This committee should be composed of Federal, State, local, related agencies, health professionals, individuals and advocates.

2. Priority and precedence be given to research funding of alternate care delivery services, especially as relates to whole person medical models. All funded studies should be of careful scientific design, and especially include some that are studies controlled in whole persons models, compared to the institutionalizing models.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Social Service Delivery and Outreach/Older Americans As A Growing National Res:

RECOMMENDATIONS: NUMBER 5

Research projects: Whereas almost one out of five rural elderl persons had incomes below the official poverty guidelines in 197 and whereas rural residents possess uniquely different healt service problems, conditions and delivery service requirements c urban or suburban residents, be it resolved that research pro jects to make a comparative study of the Rural/Urban Elderly c the Aging process be funded by Congress, and be it further re sovled that Teaching Nursing Homes and Senior Centers, Communit Health and Mental Health programs be implemented across th Nation with at least 1/2 of them being located in Rural Areas

IMPLEMENTATION:

Projects should be implemented by the Naitonal Institute on Agin and the National Institute on Health. These special researc projects should be placed in areas that have been searched out a to their willingness to cooperate with the National Institute and that their leadership track record be checked out. College and Universities could be invited as co-sponsors with both sharing in the authority and responsibility of the projects.

RECOMMENDATION: Number 588A

Research on comprehensive Service Delivery Systems for older people at the local level be completed in the 1980's.

IMPLEMENTATION:

An ongoing research committee be established. Representatives should include federal, state and local government, all related area agencies, organizations, individuals and advocates.

Subcommittees be formed to cover unique needs of various categories e.g., rural elderly, minorities, handicapped and programs developed accordingly.

Local volunteerism, senior participation and area in-kind be solicited/encouraged wherever possible.

Information dissemination be networked on a continuing basis to all concerned.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Social Service Delivery and Outreach/Older Americans As A Growing National Resource

RECOMMENDATIONS: **NUMBER** 608

That research is needed which addresses the status, needs and conditions of the elderly in America, including studies which address:

- Ethnic minorities which are duly designated by the federal government (American Indians, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Blacks and Hispanics)
- needs and attitudes toward the elderly on the part of the total population
- the rural elderly
- the handicapped elderly
- intergenerational households
- various ethnic group including Euro-Americans
- retirement - pre and post
- legal services
- job opportunities
- the poor elderly
- pet facilitated pscho-therapy
- economic needs of the elderly

RECOMMENDATIONS: **NUMBER** 679

Research be developed to lessen the impact on older americans of anticipated rapid demographic and development changes both in rural and urban areas.

RECOMMENDATION: **NUMBER** 697

To study the unique needs and develop special programs for each of the following: the rural elderly, the racial minority elderly, and the handicapped elderly.

RURAL AMERICA:
COMING OF AGE
1981 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Social Service Delivery and Outreach/Older Americans As A Growing National Resource

RECOMMENDATION: **NUMBER** 656

As a "top priority: issue, we support a stronger research program into the needs and attitudes specific to the elderly living in rural areas.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. **Through increased fiscal support by the federal, state, and local governments.**
2. **Through increased monetary reinforcement from the private sector.**
3. **Through more comprehensive and qualifying training curricula for involved personnel.**
4. **More effective methods of services deliveries to all needy elderly.**
5. **A widespread dissemination of research findings at the local level.**

Resolution Adopted by Committee #3 -- Older Americans As A Continuing Resource White House Conference on the Aging, December 2, 1981.

Title V of the Older Americans Act, the Senior Community Service Employment Program, should continue in its present form with increased appropriations to permit more disadvantaged older workers to participate. The provision for forward funding should be retained to enable project sponsors to plan their activities effectively and efficiently. Title V should not be folded into any block grant employment program, but should remain a categorical program for low-income persons 55 or older.